CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL
of the
PACIFIC
LIBRARY

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

October — December 1961

LONDON
S·P·C·K
1961

Published by S.P.C.K.
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1

Printed in Great Britain by
The Talbot Press (S.P.C.K.), Saffron Walden, Essex

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Rev. Leonard Hodgson, D.D.
The Very Rev. E. S. Abbott, Dean of Westminster
The Rt Rev. R. C. Mortimer, Bishop of Exeter.
The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.

EDITOR

The Rt Rev. and Rt Hon. J. W. C. Wand, K.C.V.O., D.D.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

THE CIRCUMCISION OF CHRIST — *G. F. Dowden*

THE JESUS OF HISTORY AND FAITH — *Robert Leaney*

ORIGINS OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY — *Peter Hinchliff*

THE EUCHARIST: CATHOLIC AND EVANGELICAL MEETING-POINT — *C. S. Mann*

NON-RESIDENCE OF PAROCHIAL CLERGY IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY — *C. J. Godfrey*

A TRAP TO CATCH CALVINISTS — *Arthur Pollard*

WELSH CIRCULATING SCHOOLS — *Glanmor Williams*

WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN — *Paul Knaplund*

CHURCH AND CITY — *M. J. Jackson*

REVIEWS

A detailed list of books and reviewers appears on the following pages.

REVIEWS

GUSTAV WINGREN: *The Living Word;* JOHN D. GODSEY: *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer.* By H. G. G. Herklots

FLOYD V. FILSON: *The Gospel according to St Matthew;* J. R. H. MOORMAN: *The Path to Glory. Studies in the Gospel according to St Luke.* By H. A. Blair

E. L. ALLEN: *Christianity among the Religions.* By D. W. Gundry

J. MARINGER: *The Gods of Prehistoric Man;* ELENA QUARELLI: *Socrates and the Animals.* By A. O. Standen

Le Concile et les Conciles. By Rennie Smith

TITO COLLIANDER: *The Way of the Ascetics.* By T. L. Manson, S.S.J.E.

CLEMENS HUMILIS: *A Modern Imitation of Christ.* By T. L. Manson, S.S.J.E.

A. W. HEATHCOTE: *Israel to the Time of Solomon;* E. RIDLEY LEWIS: *The Acts of the Apostles and the Letters of St Paul.* By Frank A. F. Poulden

E. G. PARRINDER: *A Daily Bible and Prayer Book.* By George M. Bosworth

A. C. BRIDGE: *Images of God;* HARRY L. WEINBERG: *Levels of Knowing and Existence.* By F. W. Dillistone

GEDDES MACGREGOR: *Introduction to Religious Philosophy.* By W. R. Matthews

EVELYN UNDERHILL: *The Mount of Purification.* By a Sister of S.S.M.

JOHN WESLEY: *Primitive Physic.* By Norman Small

F. BOULARD: *An Introduction to Religious Sociology.* By L. W. Grensted

LEON ROTH: *Judaism—a Portrait.* By U. E. Simon

MAX WARREN: *Challenge and Response.* By A. E. A. Sulston

LOREN C. SIDELEY and others: *Social Control in a Free Society.* By P. A. Micklem

MICHAEL WINTER: *Saint Peter and the Popes.* By R. A. Markus

EDWARD ARTHUR LITTON: *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology.* By E. L. Mascall

J. A. T. ROBINSON: *Liturgy Coming to Life.* By E. C. Whitaker

HERBERT B. WORKMAN: *Persecution in the Early Church;* BERNARD MARTIN: *An Ancient Mariner.* By Gordon Huelin

JOHN BAILLIE: *Invitation to Pilgrimage;* FRANCIS J. RIPLEY: *One Christ One Church.* By Frederic Hood

Nottingham Mediaeval Studies Vol. IV; ARTHUR WILLIS: *Winchester Consistory Court Depositions 1561-1602.* By Gordon Huelin

FRANK GLENDENNING (ed.): *The Church and the Arts.* By Walter Hussey

F. L. CROSS: *The Early Christian Fathers.* By the Editor

Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Redundant Churches. By O. H. Gibbs-Smith

WILLIAM HODGKINS: *Sunday—Christian and Social Significance.* By John Drewett

PAUL WHITE: *Jungle Doctor Panorama.* By A. White-Cooper

J. M. REID: *Kirk and Nation.* By Phyllis Graham

JOHN HIGHET: *The Scottish Churches.* By Phyllis Graham

J. M. HUSSEY and P. A. MCNULTY (trans.): *A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy (Nicholas Cabasilas);* PATRICK COWLEY: *Advent: Its Liturgical Significance.* By Bernard Wigan

D. W. CLEVERLEY FORD: *An Expository Preacher's Notebook;* RALPH RICKETTS (ed.): *We are Happy. A Collection of Letters.* By George M. Bosworth

MARTIN THORNTON: *Essays in Pastoral Reconstruction.* By George M. Bosworth

A. C. SMITH: *The South Ormsby Experiment.* By George M. Bosworth

F. B. CHANCELLOR: *What's What. A Complete Guide to the Church of England;* MICHAEL HOCKING: *The Parish Seeks the Way.* By George M. Bosworth

J. S. WHALE: *Victor and Victim.* By F. W. Dillistone

GORDON HARLAND: *The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr.* By F. W. Dillistone

D. F. HUDSON: *New Testament Greek.* By John Trillo

LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD: *Key Next Door;* J. B. PHILLIPS: *God our Contemporary;* CHARLES B. TEMPLETON: *Evangelism for Tomorrow.* By George M. Bosworth

ERNEST EVANS (ed.): *Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection.* By H. E. W. Turner

THORLIEF BOMAN: *Hebrew Thought compared with Greek.* By P. A. Micklem

A. H. ARMSTRONG and R. A. MARKUS: *Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy.* By Adam Fox

R. SELBY WRIGHT (ed.): *Fathers of the Kirk.* By Eric Graham

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

The Reverend G. F. DOWDEN is Rector of St Philip's, Hulme, Manchester.

The Reverend ROBERT LEANEY is a Lecturer in Theology in the University of Nottingham.

The Reverend Canon PETER HINCHLIFF is Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Rhodes University, Grahamstown.

The Reverend C. S. MANN is at St Matthew's Westminster.

The Reverend C. J. GODFREY is Rector of Berwick St John, Shaftesbury, Dorset.

Mr ARTHUR POLLARD is Lecturer in English Literature in the University of Manchester.

Professor GLANMOR WILLIAMS is Professor of History in University College, Swansea.

Professor PAUL KNAPLUND is Emeritus Professor of History in the University of Wisconsin.

The Reverend M. J. JACKSON is Senior Chaplain of the Sheffield Industrial Mission.

All communications should be addressed to:
The Editor, Church Quarterly Review,
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London N.W.1
Articles should not normally exceed 5,000 words in length.

EDITORIAL

THE subject of demonology has been brought into popular prominence by the suggestion to leave out all mention of the devil from the revised catechism. Those responsible for the suggestion seem to have had second thoughts on the subject. Their hesitation is wise in view of the fact that at this precise moment renewed attention is being given by scholars to the place occupied by evil spirits in the biblical record. This special examination of the scriptures is certain to be followed by a fresh appraisement of the subject from the point of view of philosophy and theology. It would therefore be a mistake to give the appearance of closing the question at this juncture.

It is interesting to look over one's shelves and see how many books on the subject have been accumulating in recent years. Langton's treatise of 1942, *Good and Evil Spirits*, is the earliest of the batch and remains the most imposing. He thinks the primary source of the belief to have been "man's instinctive intuitive sense of some mysterious power operating in himself and in the world". Among the Hebrews Yahvism did a good deal towards toning down the rich demonology of Canaanite religion. The essentials however are still there, although everything is in the last resort subject to the authority of Jehovah. In this respect one remembers the renewed modern tendency to think of the early and late chapters of Job with their vivid picture of Satan not as detachable framework but as an essential part of the story. With regard to the New Testament Langton says that Jesus "appears to accept the beliefs that were current in his own time", in some cases even giving them fresh emphasis.

G. B. Caird's Canadian lectures, *Principalities and Powers*, followed twelve years later with a study in Pauline demonology. He contends that according to the main biblical tradition the fall of Satan from heaven did not occur before the creation, as Milton thought, but "coincides with the ministry of Jesus, and in particular with the crucifixion". He appears more ready to take the teaching as to devils at its face value than the common run of scholars in modern times, but he insists on the thoroughly Pauline doctrine that those who are "in Christ" are entirely out of the reach of evil spirits.

Fresh impetus was given to the discussion by J. M. Robinson's *Problem of History in Mark*.[1] Its main thesis is that St Mark saw the life of Christ as an element in the internecine struggle between God and Satan. This eternal warfare was actually carried on in space and time in the person of Jesus, the chief episodes being the repeated miracles of exorcism. In Mark's view it was the same struggle that was still being carried on by the Church, a fact that was expected to give Mark's readers a capacity for specially close understanding of the life of Jesus.

Much the same lesson has recently been enforced by two of the new S.P.C.K. Biblical Monographs, James Kallas' *The Significance of the Synoptic Miracles* and Trevor Ling's *The Significance of Satan*. The former takes the view that it is impossible to understand the miracles unless they are taken as parts of God's incessant warfare against Satan and all his hosts. They are means by which the coming of the Kingdom is both manifested and effected. Our Lord's own "words and actions were grounded in the conviction that this world was no longer God's but Satan's and that in the ministry of Jesus Satan was being destroyed and the world restored to God".

Ling thinks that Schweitzer made a grievous mistake in not linking up his apocalypticism with a recognition of the important part played by demonology in the eschatology of Jesus. He himself suggests that while man's "justification" redeemed him from his individual sin, "sanctification" was required to guard him against the presence of Satan in his social environment. It is in the common culture of every age that Satan is chiefly active. A purely individualist view of religion must therefore fail to achieve its purpose. Christ has already won the decisive battle but its consequences still remain to be worked out in society. That is the point with which the Apocalypse is mainly concerned.

Finally R. M. Frye's *God, Man, and Satan* takes us back to Milton and Bunyan with many side glances at Barth and Brunner. In the view of this author Satan is a perversion of the great but subordinate good, which was Lucifer. In other words evil "is good in its created intention but perverted from its normative goals". In any case the principle of evil is entirely subordinated to God.

This last is a fact of Christian teaching definitely to be remembered. Not only children repeating the catechism but adults

[1] No. 21 of the S.C.M. Studies in Biblical Theology, 1957.

driven near to hysteria in their struggles against evil need to be reminded that no torment can touch them, if they place themselves under the protection of God and of his Christ. The truth remains valid whether we regard Satan as a personification of evil or as a separate existent personal entity. On this latter point there is evidently more hesitation among the pundits than there was half a century ago. If a little wise agnosticism befits us at the moment, it would be as well not to anticipate the issue by expunging the name of the devil forthwith from the statute book.

THE CIRCUMCISION OF CHRIST

G. F. DOWDEN

"WHAT advantage has the Jew," asks St Paul in the letter to the Romans, "or what is the profit of circumcision?" The Jew had no doubt at all that he had the advantage of descent from his father Abraham, the "friend of God", for the merits of whose faith, for instance, the waters of the Red Sea had parted.[1] And as for circumcision, it was given to counteract the effects of the Fall and to render Abraham and his descendants perfect.[2] It effected "a perfection and soundness of man not found in nature . . . closely akin to the primitive Christian conception of salvation as complete life".[3] Hoskyns commenting on John 7. 22 writes, "The parenthesis . . . 'not that it [circumcision] is of Moses, but of the fathers' need not be taken as a correction added by the Evangelist or by some scribe. The purpose of the author is to emphasize the dignity and importance of circumcision." [4]

Paul never shows any sign of disagreement with the rite of circumcision itself but he believes that "in these last days" it has been superseded. He was too good a Jew to disapprove of it, and could boast to the Philippians that he was "circumcised the eighth day" from birth.[5] Yet the conclusion cannot be avoided that had he been asked if there were any true spiritual significance in the rite itself he would have answered no: and he would have found weighty support. Philo, for instance, says that circumcision makes for prolificness and is preventive of disease, but, much more important, it is "a symbol of man's knowing himself, and discarding the terrible disease, the vain opinion of the soul". Uncircumcision, on the other hand, is a symbol of the pleasures which delude the mind. Moreover, the part circumcised resembles the heart, for just as it generates living beings so the heart generates thoughts. Men of old thought it right that the evident and visible organ by which the objects of outward sense are generated should be made to resemble the superior and invisible part by means of which ideas are formed.[6] There is also abundant Old Testament support for regarding the actual operation of circumcision as of less importance than the "circumcision of the heart".[7] It is not only part but the whole man that must be circumcised. Paul, therefore, can speak quite naturally of "the Circumcision" which consists of those who "worship by the Spirit of God, and glory in Christ

Jesus—and have no confidence in the flesh";[8] and in Romans he can say, "Nor is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh"; and, "Circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit, not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God".[9] In passages such as these Paul transfers the meaning of "the Circumcision" from Israel as it was commonly understood to the "true" Israel, the Church of Christ whose members had undergone "the circumcision not made with hands". Of this true Israel, the Israel of "the circumcision made with hands" is but the type.

How has this change come about? Paul's most complete answer to the question is to be found in Romans where beyond the historic proof-texts we may see Paul's presentation of three persons: Adam, Abraham, Christ. Adam, the fallen man who is our own natural selves, disobedient, unfaithful—and yet by his very manhood a type of Christ; the contrast between the failure of Adam and the glorious victory of Christ—whom Paul calls "the second Adam"—runs, now explicitly, now implicitly, throughout Romans. Of even more importance than the figure of Adam, however, is that of Abraham. His obedience and faithfulness are the type of Christ's obedience and faithfulness which brought him to the Cross. Nor was it by any happy chance of lighting upon a convenient text that Paul took Abraham as his type of Christ. To the Jew of his age Abraham was the obvious example and the traditional figure of "the Righteous Man". Our Lord himself refers to the righteous dead being "in Abraham's bosom";[10] and Abraham, he says, "rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad".[11] The passages of St Luke's Gospel which we know as *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*—keystones of the New Covenant—refer to the oath or promise made to "our forefather Abraham"—and references such as this were by no means unusual.

Something of the feeling that surrounded the figure of Abraham may be seen in the Testament of Abraham and the Apocalypse of Abraham. The date of the former of these works is uncertain: G. H. Box believes the material of the story to date from the first half of the first century A.D.; M. R. James would date the work itself early in the second century.[12] Whatever the precise date, the material presents the sort of ideas about Abraham with which Paul would be familiar. In the first half of the first century, says Box, "Enoch had fallen into the background, and Abraham had become the hero of Jewish legendary lore, and the 'seal of circumcision'

had become the pledge of life".[13] As the founder of the nation which God has separated from the progeny of sinful Adam, Abraham naturally takes an important place in the biblical narrative. For Paul he is doubly important as the one in whom also the Gentiles are to be blessed; he is the father of all who are in the same relation of obedience and trust towards God whether Jews or Gentiles. Abraham believed: therefore his seed is blessed—so runs Genesis referring to the blessedness of God's chosen people. But for Paul the seed of Abraham is blessed because he is "the father of us all . . . before him whom he believed, that is God".[14] The true sons of believing Abraham, like those of the prophets, are those who follow in their fathers' footsteps: the sons of the prophets are prophets, the true sons of Abraham are—not necessarily Jews but—like him sons of faith and faithfulness, faithful men, trusting in the faithfulness of God who promises. And in Christ alone, the one truly faithful and obedient one, is the seed of Abraham seen in its entirety and its perfection.

"In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed because thou hast obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." [15] With what sadness must Paul have read these words while looking on Israel as he knew it. "The Circumcision" had been on the whole a disobedient and unfaithful people. It was only his discovery that "seed" could refer to one individual—to Christ the antitype of Abraham—that brought him new hope.[16] Christ had been "obedient even to the death of the Cross"; he had "emptied himself"[17] in performing this great act of faithfulness, but it was an emptying which had issued in the great fulfilment of Resurrection and Ascension. "Therefore God highly exalted him and gave him the name that is above every name."[18] Abraham by submitting himself to circumcision became a "perfect man"; Jesus by submitting himself to crucifixion was given the perfect name, "The Son of God with power".[19] The faith of Abraham was rewarded by God with the seal of circumcision, a demonstration of his being accounted righteous by God; the faith of Christ was rewarded with the Cross—a demonstration of the righteousness of God himself.[20] "Now *without the Law* the righteousness of God is shewn forth."[21] The Cross was, then, to Christ what circumcision was to Abraham: metaphorically, it may be said that the Cross was the true circumcision of Christ. And this is precisely what Paul seems to be saying in the second chapter of

Colossians—but for him it is something more than metaphor. On the Cross Christ "divested himself of that flesh, the medium through which he had become involved in the human experience of the hostility of the evil Potentates and Powers".[22] In divesting himself of the whole of his flesh he fulfilled the Law which demanded in circumcision only a symbolic part of it. This is "the new covenant in his blood", the perfection of that rite which was to make a "perfect" man, the true circumcision of one who unlike Adam had not "fallen short of the glory of God".

Or is all this "fancy free"? Let us leave the heady atmosphere of Colossians for the more sober air of Galatians to test our conclusions. In Galatians Paul is face to face with converts who are lapsing into the practice of "circumcision made with hands". What sort of arguments does he use against them? A few passages from the epistle will indicate the way in which his mind was working.

1. *Gal. 5. 11, 12.* "If it is true that I preach the need of circumcision why am I persecuted? If I did, the preaching of the cross would no longer give offence. I would rather they should lose their manhood, these authors of your unrest."[23] Either circumcision, it seems (the Law and with it the necessity of the outward sign), or the Cross must be preached. There can be no compromise. In his wrath Paul can even suggest that the offenders had best be emasculated (not only circumcised) rather than disturb the Galatians' belief in the efficacy of the Cross.

2. *Gal. 5. 24.* "Those who belong to Christ have crucified the flesh with its passions and its impulses."

Circumcision, as has been remarked, was widely regarded by the rabbis as a shield against the temptations of the flesh. It constituted a man "perfect". The old man, in Paul's words, was done away—or, as he says here, "crucified". It is Christ alone, the second Adam, who can truly do away the old man, through the efficacy of the Cross—the true antitype, if the point may be made again, of circumcision.

It is important in this passage to notice the aorist, ἐσταύρωσαν. Christians at the beginning of their new life "in Christ" crucified the flesh, presumably in their Baptism. In the similar passage in Romans (6. 6) the aorist is used to make the same point.

3. *Gal. 6. 12-17.* "Who are they, these people who insist on your being circumcised? They are men, all of them, who are determined to keep up outward appearances, so that the cross of Christ may

not bring persecution on them. Why, they do not even observe the law, although they adopt circumcision; they are for having you circumcised, so as to make a display of your outward conformity. God forbid that I should make a display of anything except the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world stands crucified to me, and I to the world. Circumcision means nothing, the want of it means nothing; when a man is in Christ Jesus, there has been a new creation."[24]

"Even the profession of Jesus as Messiah by the Christians", writes Lightfoot on this passage, "was a less formidable obstacle to their intercourse with the Jews than their abandonment of the Law."[25] The alternatives are to circumcise your converts or to suffer for being a follower of one who was cursed under the Law for hanging on a tree. Since the fulfilment of the type of Circumcision in the Cross of Christ it cannot be of any consequence whether converts are circumcised or not: the rite in itself now lacks any efficacy, just as in the reasoning of Hebrews the sacrifices of the Old Covenant are now of no avail since the one true sacrifice has been made at Calvary. It is obnoxious to Paul that those who have accepted the Cross of Christ as the true Circumcision should make a vain show by adhering to the old rite as well. They will boast of making converts adhere to circumcision: the only true boast is in belonging to Christ who on the Cross has "crucified the flesh with its passions and impulses".

The καινὴ κτίσις of verse 15 again recalls the "perfect man" of the old commentators on circumcision.

As his final word to the Galatians Paul claims his bearing of the scars of Jesus—the scars of the Cross—as evidence of his spiritual authority over them: "Spare me, all of you, any further anxieties; already I bear in my body the scars of the Lord Jesus."[26] In all his persecutions for the sake of the Gospel the sufferings of the Cross have been reproduced in him. This is the not surprising lot in the first century of one who has received "the circumcision not made with hands". The στίγματα of the Cross replace the στίγματα of the circumcision of the Jew. The brand of the "truly circumcised" is not the brand of circumcision of one member of the body, but the brand of a whole life crucified to the world.

To sum up before proceeding further, we may say that Circumcision, the great sign of the Law of Moses, and of God's faithfulness

to Abraham, has been cancelled in the new, true, perfect Circumcision which is the Cross of Christ. Henceforth, to circumcise is to live by law instead of by the law of love. A new relation, a new covenant, has been established by God; yet human nature being what it is we are constantly slipping back into the dead relation of Law. This is part of the work of those "angels, principalities and powers" with which we have our conflict,[27] and which would attempt to separate us from the love of God as it is newly manifested in Christ—just as it was their work also to attempt to prevent that very manifestation of God's love on the Cross.[28]

By his death on the Cross Christ made atonement for man with God, overcoming the powers of evil at the time of Passover just as at the first Passover the angel of death had been thwarted; his body was taken down from the Cross and buried; it was apparently the end of hope, yet by this end he was to be given the name which is above every name, to be "the Son of God with power". Here there are several analogies with Jewish thought about Circumcision.

Atonement. Abraham was said to have circumcised Ishmael on the day which was later to become the Day of Atonement. The blood of the covenant then shed in the act of circumcision is before God for ever as atoning power on the yearly Day of Atonement.[29]

The Day of Atonement had its beginnings in a national consciousness of sin and a terror of its consequences. The ceremonial in which the High Priest sprinkled the altar of the Holy of Holies with the blood of a slain goat while its companion was sent out with the sins of the people to Azazel in the wilderness was designed to cleanse the people of Israel from their offences, and to put them right with God. Circumcision which resembles the sacrifice in that blood is shed—and "the blood is the life"—was also designed to make a holy people, acceptable with God. It is undeniable that Paul regards the Cross as the altar whereon the blood of Christ is offered for the sins of mankind. Whatever view of Paul's teaching on the Atonement is to be taken, the Cross and the life given upon it remain central. Is it surprising that Paul should regard this great act of love as both the one great act of Atonement and the one great and perfect Circumcision for Jew and Gentile alike?

Passover. We are told that because Pharaoh forbade the children of Israel to circumcise they had undergone circumcision at the feast of the Passover, so mingling their blood with that of the Paschal lamb.[30] The Circumcision of Christ which is his Cross is

also the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb: "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us".

Burial. It was customary to bury the flesh which had been removed in circumcision.[31]

The flesh of Jesus was taken down from the Cross and buried in Joseph's new sepulchre. The body which had been scourged, spat upon, crucified and put under the curse of the Law was made to be like the rejected flesh after circumcision.

The Powers of Evil. Isaac was circumcised on the eighth day. During the preceding night his parents kept watch over him lest he should be stolen by Lilith the Devil's mother.[32]

As at any time when man is most directly under the influence of God or in closest relation with him, at the time of circumcision the forces of evil are arrayed to attack the child. Similarly, the forces of evil dogged the footsteps of the Christ throughout his earthly course until in full force they were routed on the Cross—but not until they had scored an apparent victory in the death of Jesus.[33]

Naming. On the eighth day from birth Jesus like any other Jewish boy-baby was given his name at the rite of circumcision: by his Cross which is the true Circumcision he received the name, "Son of God with power".

In conclusion, a word must be said about the connection between Circumcision, Baptism and the Cross. Returning to the figure of Abraham in Romans we find that he is not only the type of Christ, as we have seen, but also the type of the faithful Christian. He was reckoned righteous by God because he believed his promise that from the dead God could and would bring forth life.

> Abraham, when hope was dead within him, went on hoping in faith, believing that he would become "the father of many nations". He relied on the word of God which definitely referred to "thy seed". With undaunted faith he looked at the facts—his own impotence (he was practically a hundred years old at the time) and his wife Sarah's apparent barrenness. Yet he refused to allow any distrust of a definite pronouncement of God to make him waver. He drew strength from his faith, and, while giving the glory to God, remained absolutely convinced that God was able to implement his own promise. This was the "faith" which was counted unto him for righteousness.
>
> Now this counting of faith for righteousness was not recorded simply for Abraham's credit, but as a divine principle which should

apply to us as well. Faith is to be reckoned as righteousness to us also, who believe in him who raised from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, who was delivered to death for our sins, and raised again to secure our justification.[34]

The Christian also believes that God can bring life from the dead—rather that he has brought from the dead the Lord Jesus Christ: this is Christian faith, and it is the meaning of Christian Baptism which is "to die with Christ and to rise again with him"; it is the identification of every Christian with the Cross and Resurrection of Christ—identification, that is, with the true *Circumcision* of Christ which is the perfecting of mankind. It can therefore truly be called "the circumcision not made with hands".[35]

1 R. Shemaiah, quoted in Mamorstein, *Doctrine of Merits in Rabbinical Literature*, 1920, p. 37.
2 *Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. iv., 1916, p. 93b, quoting Nedarim Talmud.
3 F. Gavin, *Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*, 1928, p. 17.
4 *The Fourth Gospel*, 1948, in loc.
5 Phil. 3. 5. 6 *De Circumcisione*. 7 Deut. 10. 16, etc. 8 Phil. 3. 3.
9 Rom. 2. 28, 29. 10 Luke 16. 22, 23. 11 John 8. 56.
12 G. H. Box, *Testament of Abraham*, 1927, p. xix; M. R. James, in vol ii of *Texts and Studies*.
13 Ibid. 14 Rom. 4. 16, 17. 15 Gen. 26. 4.
16 Gal. 3. 16 ff. 17 Phil. 2. 7 ff. 18 Phil. 2. 9.
19 Rom. 1. 4. 20 Rom. 3. 25. 21 Rom. 3. 21.
22 C. A. A. Scott, *Christianity According to St Paul*, 1927, p. 35. For a consideration of the difficult passage, Col. 2. 11 ff see C. F. D. Moule, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon*, Cambridge, 1957.
23 Knox. 24 Knox. 25 *Galatians*, in loc.
26 Gal. 6. 17. 27 Eph. 6. 12. 28 Col. 2. 15.
29 Pirke Pr. Eliezer, quoted by *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 1916, vol. iv, p. 93b.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
32 *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, 1898, vol. i, p. 443b.
33 The Gospels are full of our Lord's contests with demons, and the temptations in the wilderness are struggles with Satan himself. According to Dr Lowther Clarke the magi were agents of darkness; by their worship of the infant Christ they showed his victory over the Magian arts. See *Divine Humanity*, 1936, pp. 41 ff.
34 Rom. 4. 18-25. J. B. Phillips's translation.
35 Col. 2. 11.

THE JESUS OF HISTORY AND FAITH *

ROBERT LEANEY

SCHWEITZER not only produced an interpretation of the gospel history which marks a turning-point in the "Quest of the Historical Jesus", but began in the book of that title by collecting a remarkable assembly of "lives" of Jesus most of which he needed only to exhibit in order to discredit them. He seemed to regard his own interpretation as final with much greater assurance than was usual for an investigator even of that period; and for Schweitzer himself it was final. But we see it now as belonging to the same category as the rest. True, Schweitzer did not invent evidence such as the background of the Essene brotherhood which Venturini invented without benefit of Qumran, but he did "reconstruct" the material which the evangelists had supplied, and abandoned their own construction.

The Form-Critics took a different way; the result of their work was twofold: it cast doubt on the historical authenticity of sayings and incidents while drawing attention to their theological significance; and it drew attention also to the fact that each gospel had as a whole a theological character. We have learnt therefore to respect the constructions of the evangelists because we are able to see their works as expressing the New Testament gospel; but the synoptics at least almost explicitly demand respect on further grounds: they insist upon the historicity of their subject. They say in effect not only: "This Jesus whom we preach unto you is both Lord and Christ" (cf. Acts 2. 36) but also "This Lord whom we preach unto you was Jesus of Nazareth" (cf. Mark 6. 1-6)—and thus raise great difficulties of belief for the twentieth century.

These difficulties have been emphasized by Bultmann, whom time may declare to have been an even more important influence on the twentieth century than Barth. Bultmann perhaps more than any other critic has been a paramount cause of the double difficulty facing would-be authors on the subject of Jesus of Nazareth: he has been in the forefront both of those who have removed the possibility of writing a "life" of Jesus, and of those who essay to translate into another "language" or medium (to "demythologize" conveys only half the process) the theological construction and

* Reflections prompted by *Jesus of Nazareth* (Günther Bornkamm, Hodder and Stoughton, 21s.).

significance which each evangelist has used to weld together his composition. Some scholars in the wake of Bultmann have been content to accept this position—that the synoptic gospels afford directly neither the means to write a "life" of Jesus nor to express a belief about him in terms intelligible to contemporary man. But if the Christ encountered in the Church's proclamation and teaching is the Jesus about whom the gospels write there is clearly a case for writing a book about this person, whom we might call the Jesus-of-Nazareth of faith.

It is such a book which Günther Bornkamm, Professor of New Testament in the University of Heidelberg, wrote in 1956 and which has been translated by Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James M. Robinson, incorporating improvements in the German editions of 1957 and 1959, for an English edition published by Hodder and Stoughton in 1960. Bornkamm foreswears any attempt to write a "life" although he does not believe that history (in its normal English sense) has been completely obliterated by the evangelists. It is true that it is "wiser to enquire after the motive and meaning of the early Christian confessions" (p. 188) but the task "is to seek the history *in* the Kerygma of the Gospels, and in this history to seek the Kerygma" (p. 21), for "it cannot be seriously maintained that the Gospels and their tradition do not allow enquiry after the historical Jesus. Not only do they allow, they demand this effort" (p. 22). "The Gospels are the rejection of myth. To whatever extent mythological conceptions from time to time find access to the thought and faith of the early Church, they are given once and for all the function of interpreting the history of Jesus as the history of God with the world" (p. 23).

Bornkamm is faithful to his contention that a "life" in the usually accepted sense cannot be written when he makes his shortest chapter that which shares its title with the book, but in it he includes in one paragraph an outline of the ministry of Jesus, remarking that "These meagre, indisputable facts comprise a very great deal" (p. 55).

The Christ of faith speaks directly to the individual (Bornkamm appears to imply—and this demands decision). So does the Jesus of the gospels. Indeed "we are here concerned with a most characteristic trait in the historical Jesus, one which quite accurately is confirmed by the nature of his preaching" (p. 60).

Bornkamm does not of course use such a chink as a door through which uncritically to welcome everything narrated in the gospels. With regard to the Lord's miracles, he finds it "difficult to doubt the physical healing powers which emanated from Jesus" but is "driven to" a "critical judgment" on the nature miracles (pp. 130 f). Reasonable as this may seem, it is in the realm of faith in miracle that Bornkamm's position seems most vulnerable. In spite of his acceptance of the healing miracles (which might seem to justify regarding as authentic the Messianic claim of Luke 7. 18-35; Matt. 11. 2-19) Bornkamm prefers to speak "of a movement of broken Messianic hopes, and of one who was hoped to be the Messiah, but who not only at the moment of failure, but in his entire message and ministry, disappointed the hopes which were placed in him" (p. 172). If he disappointed these hopes "in his entire message and ministry" how did they come to be placed in him? Again, it is no doubt entirely legitimate to conclude that Jesus did not claim any of the titles given him in the gospels, but this was for the positive reason that, in Bornkamm's own words, "No customary or current conception, no title or office which Jewish tradition and expectation held in readiness, serves to authenticate his mission, or exhausts the secret of his being" (p. 178). This is far from leading to the conclusion which Bornkamm draws in the next sentence but one, when he closes Chapter VIII (The Messianic Question) with the words: "We thus learn to understand that the secret of his being could reveal itself to his disciples for the first time (*erst*) in his resurrection" (German edition, p. 163) or, as the English translation has it ". . . his being could only reveal itself to his disciples in his resurrection" (p. 178). It has already been claimed that faith (*Glaube*) must first "break down at the cross of Jesus, only to be rebuilt upon his cross and resurrection" (p. 173). Ernst Fuchs, in a valuable extended *Auseinandersetzung* with Bornkamm's work (the second German edition) objected that it is not really "the faith (*Glaube*) itself which must break down in the cross of Jesus, but a faith . . . bound by traditional presentations (*Vorstellungen*) . . . which . . . had to give way to a picture of Jesus which bore the image above all of the cross of Jesus." This Pauline emphasis, Fuchs contended, is found in the gospels no less than in Paul himself. Jesus did not disappoint hopes but amended them, did not shatter a false belief so much as endure (*ertrug*) it. This is certainly the

manner in which the synoptic gospels—whose claim to be history Bornkamm himself makes so clear—present the facts: the disciples left all to follow the Lord, were blind to his real identity, embraced the dangerously misleading half-truth that he was the Messiah, were unable to entertain the idea of the inevitability of his suffering, and ran away at his arrest; but they had their eyes opened to the fact not merely that there was a risen Lord in whom to believe but that *their* Lord had risen and that it had been necessary for him to enter his glory by suffering. Above all, they witness to the fact that Jesus himself by both word and deed (as Fuchs would emphasize) educated their faith. In the course of this education he appeared to them in the upper room and insisted both that "it is I myself" (Luke 24. 39)—the Lord they already knew—and also that his explanation of the necessity of his suffering (Luke 24. 44b-7) he had already given them "while still with you" (44a). The education was part of his earthly ministry.

The main criticism of this book would therefore urge these considerations: the position adopted is not consistent with the claim which seemed to be rightly made at the outset, that the Jesus with whom we are—or ought to be—confronted in the Church's proclamation is the Jesus of the whole New Testament, not only the Jesus who has been raised from the dead. It is true that he is the Lord over death and that by union with him we enter a new life where sin and death no longer reign. If we have indeed so entered we know neither Christ—*nor anyone else*—κατὰ σάρκα (2 Cor. 5. 16); but the object of our "knowledge" is not limited to the risen Christ, for not only the risen Christ but also the Christ of the earthly ministry must be known κατὰ πνεῦμα (though Paul does not use this phrase here, it is the natural antithesis which he seems to imply).

In spite of the importance of this point, the heart of the book will be judged by many to be Chapter V. The Will of God, a treasury of thoughtful and challenging interpretations of the gospels. It contains the passage which Fuchs thought was Bornkamm's *Höhepunkt*. He has claimed that "the new righteousness is qualitatively a new and different attitude" and "to live on the basis of God's presence and in expectation of his future, this is what Jesus aims at in his commandment: 'That you may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven!' " Bornkamm then writes, "This is where Jesus' message of the approach of the kingdom of heaven

and his preaching of the will of God become completely one. Both show forth the pure and unveiled will of God" (p. 108). This in a nutshell is the attractive solution of the problem of unrealized eschatology which has been discussed in the previous chapter (The Dawn of the Kingdom of God).

We have already seen the emphasis which the author lays upon the resurrection as breaker and maker of faith. This is illuminated later in the book by a remarkable refutation of Faust's, "They are celebrating the resurrection of the Lord, for they themselves are resurrected." Bornkamm rejoins with words which are extremely pertinent but which demand further explication: "No, they are not themselves resurrected. What they experience is fear and doubt, and what only gradually awakes joy and jubilation in their hearts is just this: They, the disciples, on this Easter Day, are the ones marked out by death, but the crucified and buried one is alive" (pp. 184 f). As a refutation of Faust this is superb, but as an explanation of Easter faith it will hardly suffice, for it explains neither that nor the rise of the "Easter legends". This task is apparently rejected: "The event of Christ's resurrection from the dead, his life and his eternal reign, are things removed from historical scholarship. History cannot ascertain and establish conclusively the facts about them as it can with other events of the past. The last historical fact available to them is the Easter faith of the first disciples" (p. 180). Criticism of this position demands far more space than can be expended here but two comments may be made: first, Christ's resurrection is according to our tradition an event in time and cannot therefore be classed without further ado exclusively with his life and eternal reign; second, historical scholarship cannot establish the fact of this event, but it can show that it is the most likely hypothesis to explain others related to it. The duty of exegesis is not exhausted when it has described *faith in* Christ's resurrection, especially when, in contrast to Bultmann, as Fuchs points out, Bornkamm distinguishes between the resurrection of Jesus as the ultimate miracle which rightly belongs to faith and the faith which believes it.

The attitude to historicity in other matters can be concisely illustrated by the criticism of the predictions of the passion: ". . . that Jesus had to reckon with the possibility of his own violent end, we have no reason to doubt, however justified our grounds for disputing the historical validity of the individual

prophecies concerning his suffering and resurrection" (pp. 154-5). The wheel of criticism has come full circle: Jesus did not perform the actions or utter the sayings recorded by the synoptics but his career and teaching were such that they rightly represent them by saying that he did.

Much space has been given to a discussion of Bornkamm's position on the historicity of the tradition about Jesus; but many readers will rightly wish to know whether the book will enable or facilitate for a contemporary reader "estranged from the heritage of the Church" (p. 10) an encounter with the Lord of history. The answer is that if the reader does as the author asks and brings "energy and patience to it"—and, we ought to add for reasons already given, a critical mind—he will find here a book which will do more than stimulate and guide his search. For nothing which has been urged above on the subject of the book's appraisal of the resurrection faith of the gospels should be taken to detract from the impression of a fulness of faith in the author. Scholarly encounter with the gospels does not preclude but often, as this book illustrates, involves encounter with the Lord. Wrestling with the evidence one may suddenly stop, hearing the voice, "I am he." This appears to have been the experience of our author. No review can do justice to the quality of his scholarship and devotion. The expression is both clear and condensed and almost every sentence both reveals and demands incomparably more thought than its economic length would suggest, a characteristic preserved in an energetic translation.

Here indeed is a teacher who has understood and made his own the gospel message; he adopts the method of describing the period and environment in which God's revelation through Jesus was made and proceeds to expound with great profundity the meaning of the Kingdom of God and of the Will of God as taught and lived by the Lord in this environment, describing also the meaning of Discipleship, the Messianic Question, and Jesus Christ as the fulfilment of Jesus of Nazareth. Fifty-one final pages of this English edition are devoted to the usual lists and indexes, and include three appendixes for students, which are through their brevity perhaps of more value to the "intelligent layman" than to the serious student; but all in all this is a serious work of a most consistent high standard which will be widely recommended as an authoritative devout interpretation by a thorough-going critic of

the meaning of those gospels of which R. H. Lightfoot complained that "we trace in them but the outskirts of his ways" (*History and Interpretation in the Gospls*, p. 225). If we share the faith of the woman with the issue of blood we shall find this enough (Mark 5. 28); and this is what contemporary "estranged" man will discover if he will read Bornkamm with attention.

ORIGINS OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

PETER HINCHLIFF

I HAVE chosen to write this as a narrative in the first person for the somewhat paradoxical reason that it is not really all my own work. It seemed easier to indicate precisely how and where others had contributed to it if I handled it in this way rather than in some more conventional academic manner. What follows is, moreover, not so much an hypothesis, as a collective questionnaire, which we hope will be answered by some competent specialist in the field.

Dom Gregory Dix was responsible for *popularizing* [1] two notions about the early history of the liturgy which seem to be generally accepted. The first is that the distinctively Christian part of the primitive Eucharist was the scheme of four actions; the first and longest part of the rite was simply an adaptation of the synagogue worship of the time.[2] The second is that the Christian ministry took the particular form it did chiefly because of the liturgical function of each "order".[3] What is rather odd is that, in spite of the general currency of these ideas in the liturgical field, so little use has been made of them in studies on the ministry. One would have thought that the obvious conclusion to be drawn from them was that—if the ministry is shaped by the liturgy, and if the liturgy is a synagogue liturgy with an added Christian and sacramental action—the ministry might well be the synagogue ministry with an added Christian and sacramental function. There have been many scholars who have argued that the ministry does originate in the organization of the synagogue, but none of them that I know of has sought it in quite this way.[4] Dom Gregory himself, in his ecstatic but ultimately unsuccessful pursuit of the *shaliach* hypothesis,[5] did not follow this line.

My own interest in the matter arose out of two quite unrelated conversations with colleagues. One of them,[6] discussing the preservation of the oral tradition before the gospels were written, maintained that the deacon acquired his liturgical function of reading the gospel because his office early incorporated that of the ὑπηρέτης of earlier times. Υπηρέτης, when used ecclesiastically, is the Greek equivalent of *hazzan*, the synagogue attendant or minister, who acted as guardian of the scriptures and as catechist. Υπηρέτης is also the designation used by Papias of St Mark in relation to St Peter [7]—the man who preserved and guarded the oral

tradition and who, one might suppose, taught and recited it while St Peter was chiefly concerned with preaching. (Would that make the *kerygma* and the tradition different things?) In this way there developed the liturgical office of the deacon who read the gospel which the bishop expounded. Epiphanius indeed makes the three titles equivalent [8] — ἀξανιτῶν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς διακόνων ἑρμηνευομένων ἢ ὑπηρετῶν.

My other colleague [9] was concerned to ask why, if the widely held theory of the origins of the ministry is correct, a body of equal "elders", a sort of kirk session, should suddenly have thrown up a monarchical president who monopolized the control of worship and the sacraments and reduced the elders to a polite background while the bishop and his deacons did everything. It is all very well to say that it is natural that one man should become president of the board, but why should his office become permanent and so powerful in so comparatively short a time, without even a whimper from anyone? And why should that process be so almost universal? Even Canon Streeter's theory does not provide an answer. The picture he paints is one of struggle and controversy (but there is no record of any such dispute), but he gives no reason for the fact that the same side (monepiscopacy) *appears to have won in every case*, except to say that it is often advantageous to an oligarchy that one of their number should become a dictator even if they lose some of their individual rights thereby. It is all very well to say that Ignatius was the real culprit [10] but there must have been some reason to account for Ignatius' success. Nor do his epistles make sense as an argument for monarchical episcopacy unless some pre-eminence was already accorded to the "bishop". A great deal can, however, be made of Streeter's theory provided that it is possible to accept that "bishops" already possessed a primacy of some kind (and perhaps, in view of *Ep. ad Smyrn.* viii, a pre-eminence of an especially liturgical kind). The development of the belief in the universal jurisdiction of the papacy from an *acknowledged* primacy might in that case provide an instructive parallel.

If one assumes that Christian worship developed from synagogue worship and that the ministry developed alongside it, then perhaps an answer is provided. In the synagogue there was a "ruler", whose authority was almost entirely liturgical. Dom Gregory says, "Doubtless the 'ruler' was always a person of weight in the local

community [11] and as such he would figure among the presbyters who jointly governed it. But actually *qua* 'ruler' his authority was limited to the arrangement of public worship (which he did not usually conduct himself) and could be exerted only within the synagogue buildings. Conversely the presbytery had no direct authority over worship. . . .[12] With the enhanced importance of liturgical worship in the Christian "synagogue", it is possible to argue, it was precisely his liturgical pre-eminence which gave the ruler his "edge" over the other members of the presbytery.[13]

These suggestions that ἐπίσκοπος and διακόνος are evolved from the ἀρχισυνάγωγος and ὑπηρέτης seemed to be clear indications that one ought at least to *look* for a parallel development of liturgy and ministry from synagogue patterns. Prima facie it seemed a reasonable hypothesis. Much has lately been made in the liturgical movement of the close and organic connection between liturgy and pastorate (or apostolate). It did not seem too far-fetched to suppose that just as synagogue worship developed into the Christian synaxis to which there was added the sacramental action of the Eucharist, so the synagogue organization became the basis of the Christian ministry, but with a new sacramental authority and pastoral function.

It was extremely difficult, with the limited resources available to me, to discover very much in detail about the liturgical and other functions of the synagogue "ministers".[14] It seemed safe to use what little information I could find in the *Mishnah* and the *Talmud*, since it did not seem likely that Christian practices would have had much influence in this particular field. But too many modern writers make *ex cathedra* pronouncements about first century synagogue practices, without giving any sort of authority for what they say. Dom Gregory gives none in the passage I have just quoted from him. The information I have gathered together is, therefore, of doubtful value, and it is this which makes what I have written less a hypothesis than a question.

The picture that emerged for me, for what it is worth, was something like this. Every Jewish community of any size had its synagogue. The synagogue was governed by a body of elders (who were also probably the elders of the community as a whole). This body had absolute authority in matters of religious discipline and possessed the power of excommunication. They also functioned as

a court of law, and there was, of course, no real distinction between ecclesiastical and civil law. In the larger communities the elders probably included some scribes "ordained" by a recognized rabbi. At all events a scribe might settle wherever there was a synagogue. His authority did not depend on the local community, but he would be likely to be one of the elders of the place.

The synagogue itself was usually a separate building, but it might include an apartment for the synagogue attendant, or conversely might be no more than a room in someone's house, specially set aside.

Besides the body of elders there would usually be the other two types of official—the "ruler" and the "attendant". The ruler (there might sometimes apparently be more than one) was the president of the liturgical assembly, who maintained order, directed the proper performance of the service, and decided who was to perform each part. He was not usually himself a scribe, but ranked after the scribes. There was also the attendant or minister of the synagogue, a kind of superior verger, but also a good deal more. He was the administrative officer who supervised poor relief, executed sentences involving corporal punishment (at the direction of the elders), and was teacher and catechist, besides performing those liturgical duties implied by his function as keeper of the scriptures.

There are a good many passages in the New Testament which seem to imply that the Church of the apostolic age possessed some very similar system. We know of the elder-overseers in every place and that they exercised a good deal of authority, usually but not always in subordination to the "apostolic" authority.[15] We know that St Paul urged the wise and the honourable (i.e. the natural elders of the community) to undertake their proper duty as a court of law.[16] We know that the elder-overseers could exercise an authority which amounted to the power to excommunicate.[17] We know that there was the same sort of scrambling for the chief seats (i.e. the seats of the elders, probably facing the people) in Christian as in Jewish synagogues.[18] We hear of churches that were in people's houses.[19] One such seems to have come into being because St Paul staged a "walk-out" from the local synagogue and took the ruler with him.[20] St Paul was certainly most anxious that proper order should be kept in Christian worship,[21] and presumably as anxious that there should be someone to keep it. He was equally anxious that the churches should care for the poor, and that they

should send a sort of tribute to the holy poor in Jerusalem.[22] We know that in Jerusalem, at least, officials were appointed[23] to prevent the kind of uncharity which later also appeared at Corinth.[24] Nor was the function of these officials, again at least in Jerusalem, confined to merely administrative matters. It is not in the least unreasonable to suppose that the very similar organization needed for Christian churches should have been copied from the familiar pattern of the Jewish synagogues. And it is almost certain, from what we know of St Paul, that he would have preferred to appoint the necessary officers himself,[25] rather than leave the matter to some more "democratic" process.

Moreover what we know of early Christian worship supports the idea that the function of the ministers evolves from that of their synagogue counterparts. This is true, at any rate, of the synaxis and that is the only part of the rite which it is proper to compare directly with that of the synagogue. In the primitive Church the bishop presides at and controls the liturgy. He appears to possess all liturgical authority, and the presbyters have not so much a function as a *place* proper to their office.[26] The president decides what is to be read and probably who is to read it, though here the deacons have a special function as the proclaimers and guardians of the gospel. It is true that the ministers have acquired far more definite status and rights and a greater dignity. The president takes far more of the service himself and in particular has the distinctive function of preaching the sermon, which in the synagogue belonged to the professional exegete. But the pattern is recognizable.

It is possible, too, to guess how the changes came about. It has always been one of the difficulties in dealing with theories about the Christian ministry, that that ministry has to have both a local and a universal authority.[27] But if it is true that the apostles (in the wider sense of that term) appointed elders in every place, and if it is true that there was in the early Church a peripatetic ministry universally accepted, as well as a local ministry, then it is possible to see how, on the analogy of the place occupied by the Jewish scribes in the synagogue, the universal authority of the apostles might pass to the local ministry.[28] Moreover the new functions of the president, and of the deacons for that matter, in the performance of the liturgy would give them a new importance even in the synaxis, which their synagogue counterparts never had. And the distinctively "episcopal" functions in the Eucharist, preaching and

the breaking of bread with thanksgiving, would surely be just those things most closely associated with the apostolic order and fellowship.

The ideas I have been outlining here I embodied in a paper read to a local discussion group composed very largely of Anglicans and Presbyterians.[29] It was inevitable that we should also begin to discuss the report on the conversations between the Churches of England and Scotland.[30] Assuming for the moment that the conjecture put forward in my paper was the true explanation of the origins of the ministry, we felt that we had here something very typical of the early Church. As in the case of Baptism and the Eucharist, as in the case of Israel itself, we felt that we had here some traditional Jewish custom or concept transformed by Christ and his Church into something recognizable indeed in its outline and pattern, but unrecognizable in its new function and importance.[31]

But it also seemed clear that the Church, having woven a pattern of ministry out of the apostolic commission, the authority of the Church itself, the customs of the synagogue, and the new pastoral and liturgical situation, continued to weave new patterns as the situation changed. That was inevitable since the Church is an organic body. The influence of the Greek city-state tradition of Asia Minor (the centre of gravity for the early Church), acting upon the community tradition of *diaspora* Judaism, patterned the ministry into that of the city diocese—one bishop, one city, one church. And the same process began to give the presbyter a greater pastoral and liturgical importance as the bishop's delegate wherever the city was large enough to contain more than one Christian community. It would be inevitable that as this happened more and more stress would be laid upon episcopal succession and ordination, if the unity of the diocese and of the Church was to be retained.[32]

The influence of the administrative reforms of the later Roman Empire, the larger rural areas and the tribal missions of the West, together with the unpopularity of the χορεπισκοποι as a solution to the problem, would hasten the process. The diocese became larger, the bishop more remote, while the presbyter became the parson and the normal agent of the Church in liturgical and pastoral affairs. The Europe of the barbarian states, and still later the Europe of Christian feudalism, would carry this further until the position was reached which still obtains in most episcopalian

bodies to-day, when the bishop is thought of primarily as the bishop of an area, a territory, containing a number of "parishes" each with its own parson.

The critics of such a system see only too clearly that although it has maintained the visible unity of one parish and diocese with another, and preserved the universal authority of its ministry, it has many obvious weaknesses. The liturgical, pastoral, and administrative functions no longer coincide. The bishop is so remote as to have lost all but the final administrative and liturgical responsibility; the parish priest has acquired almost every liturgical and pastoral function, yet in theory he possesses no direct ἐπισκοπή; the deacon is vestigial, possessing only a ceremonial liturgical function; and the pastoral needs are not being met, so there is a multiplicity of "lay ministries" whose authority and responsibility is extremely vague and ill-defined.[33]

It is equally clear, on the other hand, that Calvin, Knox, and Melville[34] had created, perhaps by accident, a system which was in one sense closer to this hypothetical primitive pattern—the pastor/presbyter, with his body of ruling elders, together exercising ἐπισκοπή over the parish. The elders themselves, though in a sense a "lay ministry" (whatever that may mean), exercise some sort of pastoral care over the flock. And yet the critic can again point to some obvious weaknesses. This system was achieved only at the cost of a violent break with the organic tradition of the Church and it involved the loss of the visible safeguard of unity and of the universal authority of the ministry such as the bishops provide. Nor is the system free from inconsistencies, as is evidenced by the fact that "presbyters" and "elders" are different things, and yet the presbyter is not ἐπίσκοπος since he alone does not exercise ἐπισκοπή.

These were the questions which were very much in our minds, but for which we had no answers:

(1) Now that the Church has once again become a Church of small communities in a largely apathetic or even hostile world, might it not be the time to re-shape the ministry again and to use as our model something like the primitive community pattern (if, indeed, that was the primitive pattern), where oversight, counsel, or service remained the function of the same "order", whether it was exercised in the pastoral, the liturgical, or the administrative sphere?

(2) Is it not dangerous (because it would be to depart even further from this pattern) to "super-add" bishops to a presbyterian system, and elders to an episcopalian system, under the impression that this would bring us nearer to an ecumenical solution?

(3) Would it not be better to do something far more radical to both modern systems, such as (from the Anglican point of view) having a "bishop" in every community (perhaps about the size of a rural-deanery), with a college of "part-time priests", and a staff of professional deacons as assistants in such things as communicating large congregations, visiting, and administrative routine?

I must insist that we are not in the least fussy about the details of such a scheme, but we do feel that what is needed is a radical scheme and not one which is simply more confusing. I would also point out that such a scheme need not necessarily alter provincial or national organization for handling the "big-business" side of Church affairs.

[1] Neither of these two ideas was, of course, actually invented by Dix, but were already pretty commonplace before his time. But they are now so generally associated with his name that it is a convenient short-hand to refer to them as Dix's ideas.

[2] *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Dacre Press, 2nd ed., 1954, 48ff.

[3] Ibid., 27ff.

[4] That Christian elders were evolved from their synagogue counterparts is accepted by such very different writers as J. B. Lightfoot, *Commentary on Philippians*, Macmillans, 4th ed., 1908, 191ff, B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, Macmillan, 1929, 73, and B. Minchin, *Every Man in His Ministry*, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1960, 47ff. Bishop Wand comes closest to advocating the hypothesis I wish to advance (in *The Early Church*, Methuen, 3rd ed., 1949, 30) without, however, linking it with the liturgical theories put forward by Dix. Lightfoot's rejection of the "common but baseless" idea that deacons might derive from the synagogue *hazzan* is weakened by the fact that he bases it on the assumption that the Seven of Acts 6. 1ff served as an exact model for the diaconate elsewhere (for which there is no evidence) and by the fact that he does not, of course, consider the liturgical aspect at all.

[5] K. E. Kirk (ed.), *The Apostolic Ministry*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1946, 228ff. I believe that it would be just as easy and convincing to base a quite opposite theory on what evidence there is. Putting together the fact that in the synagogue the person who offered the prayers was called *shaliach* of the congregation (Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. "Synagogue", p. 641, and cf. Dix in Kirk op. cit., 229 and especially footnote 5) together with 1 Tim. 4. 14, and Jerome's story about the Alexandrian consecrations (Ep. cxlvi. 1.), one might as well argue that if a "bishop" was the *shaliach* of anyone, he was *shaliach* of the presbytery.

[6] W. D. Maxwell, author of *Outline of Christian Worship*, etc., and now Professor of Divinity and Dean of the Faculty in this University.

[7] Eusebius, *H. E.*, III. xxxix. 15, cf. Acts 13. 5 and Luke 1. 3. Cf. R. O. P. Taylor, *The Groundwork of the Gospels*, Blackwell, 1946, pp. 23ff.

[8] *Haer.* xxx. 11.

[9] J. A. I. Ager Hamilton, formerly editor-in-chief of the Union Government War Histories and now Director of the Institute of Social and Economic Research in this University, who prefers to describe himself as an historian with ecclesiastical hobbies.

[10] Streeter, op. cit., 163ff.

[11] There is an interesting inscription from a synagogue in Jerusalem prior to A.D. 70 which speaks of the ruler of the synagogue as a wealthy founder and patron of the community, and seems to imply that in some cases the office might be hereditary. (G. E. Wright, *An Introduction to Biblical Archaeology*, Duckworth, 1960, 160.)

[12] In Kirk, op. cit., 235.

[13] This point is developed infra.

[14] Apart from a hunt through Danby's edition of the *Mishnah* and checking specific references in the *Babylonian Talmud* (ed. I. Epstein, Soncino Press, 1936), I was forced to rely on such works as the article in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* already referred to (which proved most useful), C. Guignebert—*The Jewish World in the Time of Christ*, Kegan Paul, 1939, and an old book by Edersheim—*Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, Religious Tract Society, 1908, and incidental references in the works of Dix and others already cited.

[15] E.g. Acts 20. 28ff and 3 John 10.

[16] 1 Cor. 6. 1ff.

[17] Tit. 1. 13; 2. 15; 3. 10f.

[18] James 2. 2ff, cf. Matt. 23. 6.

[19] Rom. 16. 5; Col. 4. 15; Philem. 2.

[20] Acts 18. 7.

[21] 1 Cor. 14. 26.

[22] E.g. Gal. 2. 10 and 1 Cor. 16. 1ff.

[23] Acts 6. 1ff.

[24] 1 Cor. 11. 21.

[25] Acts 19. 23.

[26] Dix, op. cit., 33.

[27] Cf. E. L. Mascall (reviewing *A Manual of Church Doctrine according to the Church of Scotland*) in *Church Quarterly Review*, CLXII, 103.

[28] Cf. Streeter, op. cit., 104ff.

[29] Two episcopalians (both Anglican), 3 presbyterians (1 Scottish, 2 Dutch Reformed), and 1 Methodist.

[30] *Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches*, S.P.C.K., 1957. nb. 15f.

[31] What follows is not in any sense the agreed conclusion to which the group came, but rather the general course which the discussion followed.

[32] Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, *Liturgy Coming to Life*, Mowbrays, 1960, 54.

[33] Cf. *The Development of the Ministry*, a working paper by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, S.P.C.K., 1959, nb. 33ff.

[34] G. Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation*, C.U.P., 1960, 102ff, and 183ff.

THE EUCHARIST: CATHOLIC AND EVANGELICAL MEETING-POINT

C. S. MANN

IT IS not surprising that the Church's bond of unity should be the cause of so much division, and even of acrimony: that which touches so vitally the Church's very life will inevitably affect all the tensions of that life, and will reflect them, too. What is here said is to be understood in the context of Anglicanism, and—much as I happen to dislike the use of the two terms as commonly used—I have adhered to popular usage in the employment of "catholic" and "evangelical".

If the evangelical often emphasizes the Pauline insistence on "justification by faith", to the virtual exclusion of other Pauline considerations, with the implication that catholics fail to do the doctrine justice, it has to be admitted that there is truth in the charge. There has been in the past a use of language by catholics which would seem to suggest the intervention of the Church (conceived in clerical terms) ere ever the fruits of redemption can be appropriated. So often, the catholic speaks of the Church as though it was a kind of *quidditas superaddita* to the person of Christ. *Both* traditions suffer so often from a defective view of the Church, and if the evangelical speaks occasionally of the Church as of a kind of voluntary association of believers, it is but the reverse side of that catholic coin which makes of the Church a *tertium quid*.[1] The mutual suspicions and misunderstandings come to a head in our thinking about the eucharist, and it is the hope that the one startling suggestion which this article offers may be of some help in determining a way out of the impasse.

The evangelical suspects that the catholic holds to a doctrine of sacrifice in the eucharist which is, in effect, a double offering. With sorrow, one has to admit that popular, careless language by catholics about the eucharist (especially with regard to "special intentions") has about it a crudely pagan ring of propitiation by means of an interposed and manipulated presence. The dissatisfaction of the catholic with the rite of 1662 is often felt to be bound up with this kind of consideration. For his part, the catholic regards with intolerance the evangelical plea that we, as members of the baptized, eucharistic body, have nothing to offer save

ourselves and our worship—and sometimes, not even that. Both, catholic and evangelical, are victims of a medieval theology of the passion which had forgotten the fourth gospel, had no realization of the pre-incarnation ministry of the Son, and had—quite fatally—supposed that the cruciality of the cross was such that the Son's oblation was coterminous with the death on Calvary (cf. the prayer of consecration in 1662). The catholic may entertain suspicions that what matters to the evangelical is the recalling to the believer's mind of the cross and passion, and the eucharist only something which the Lord intended to be a sacramental means of achieving this. The evangelical, on his part, may be pardoned for supposing that catholics teach the eucharist as something which (however identified with the Son's oblation) *we* are enabled to offer, and something which can be used as a bargaining-counter in our approach to God. If the catholic thinks of the eucharist as a presence which "comes down", there to be pleaded, and the evangelical is guilty of under-stressing the resurrection-exaltation, then both are indebted to the middle ages. This, no doubt, is crudely put: but we have a habit of dressing our crude ways of thought in terms which hide the reality.

The suggestion which is here offered, in an attempt to cut away the wealth of misunderstanding which has surrounded the eucharist, is that we have the courage to excise from the rite altogether the narrative of the institution. I am well aware that, baldly thus stated, it is about the most revolutionary suggestion which an occidental Christian can well make. More than that—it cuts at the very root of more than 1,500 years of established usage, tradition, and devotion. Yet the suggestion is made in deadly earnest, and it is made for the following reasons. First, the narrative of the institution is no more an essential part of the eucharist than is a recital of the institution of passover essential to the passover-rite—quite to the contrary. Secondly, its present central position in the rite has led to a quite disastrous interpretation of the eucharistic oblation, which—so far as the Roman rite is concerned—the language of the rite itself will not support. Thirdly, so used, the narrative may give rise to very serious misinterpretation of a vital clause in the Greek of the narrative itself. Fourthly, a central position for the institution-narrative has succeeded in masking the central themes of the New Testament conception of God's saving act in his Messiah. Before we deal with these reasons in their order,

it will be necessary to clear the ground with regard to the nature of the eucharistic sacrifice.

First, as to the presence of the Lord in the eucharist, it should hardly be necessary to say that I subscribe to the formularies of the Church of England in holding that there is a real and incorporal presence of the Lord's Body and Blood in the eucharist, wholly independent of the faith of the recipients. I would add to that the further consideration that philosophical and physical explanations of the *manner* of the presence all ultimately darken counsel, and we are mercifully driven back to the phrase "sacramental presence". Secondly, Article XXXI expresses its condemnation of a notion of the eucharistic oblation which—whatever popular language may have asserted—had no foundation either in the *canon missae* or the teaching of the Fathers. But of what kind *is* the eucharistic sacrifice? [2] Any suggestion that there is anything which Christians can offer, *apart from Christ*, or *in addition to*, Christ's own offering, must be rigidly excluded from our thinking: this will demand a most exact use of terminology, at the moment all too infrequent. The truth is that, *in Christ* the Church which is his Body offers to the Father the material gifts which God has himself given, and which the Son commanded us to use (cf. 1 Chron. 29. 14). Then, in so offering to God his own bounty, the Church makes oblation of herself, in union with the Son who founded her in the Spirit. Finally—and vitally—the eucharist is *anamnesis* of the whole redemptive work of the Saviour, and where his re-called, re-presented ("made present again") oblation is, there also is the Saviour. It is not necessary to labour the meaning of the word *anamnesis*: it has long ago passed into technical use, both among liturgists and New Testament scholars. But it is of some moment to emphasize that in the Greek Old Testament—and so in the New Testament—the word is very far from indicating the bare mental process which is suggested to us by the English "remember". When the Hebrew "remembered", the very act unleashed whole spiritual forces (cf. 1 Sam. 1. 19; 1 Kings 17. 18; Hosea 9. 9). Supremely, when God "remembers" Israel, it is to save her (cf. Luke 1. 54-5).

We now come to deal with the four reasons outlined above for displacing the institution-narrative.

1. It is noteworthy that in the passover-rite, in reply to the question of the youngest at table, he who presides over the feast

does not answer with a narrative of the institution, but with the *anamnesis* which begins: "A wandering Aramaean was my father . . ." (Deut. 26. 5ff). The rubrics of the rite itself merely give point to the question: it is with the *meaning* of the rite that the liturgical form is concerned (cf. *The Mishnah*, Pesachim 10. 4-5) To this we have to return when we come to consider the Christian passover.

2. This section must perforce be longer than the others, for it is here that we meet with the specific catholic-evangelical controversy. The evangelical often suspects—and equally often with good reason—that the catholic view of the eucharistic oblation is, for all the refinement of much of the terminology, an essentially *double* offering. That is to say, there is an offering of the material gifts of bread and wine at the offertory, and then, after the consecration (considered as being essentially bound up with the institution-narrative), an offering of the transmuted gifts to the Father. Of this second offering, catholics have been unguarded enough to say before now: "In the eucharist, the Church offers Christ to the Father." Apart from the central position of the narrative of the institution, it is hard to see how the view could obtain credence at all.[3] But so false to primitive thought is this conception that it has no place at all in the Roman rite, not even with the addition of offertory prayers before the *Sursum Corda*. That rite speaks to us of an age which thought in terms of the eucharistic offering, not in terms of an "offered presence". There is not a syllable in the Roman rite which suggests a presence "coming down" from heaven to be (more or less temporarily) sited on mundane altars. Quite to the contrary: all the emphasis of the *canon missae* is on that offering of Christians-in-Christ, made with the gifts he commanded, and taken up into the perfect oblation of Christ. Of all this, the most significant feature of the Roman rite is the language it employs in dealing with the eucharistic gifts.[4] If we include the intruded offertory prayers, then the contention we have made above is, in fact, heavily reinforced. On no less than three occasions, the eucharistic gifts are spoken of as *hostia immaculata, sanctum sacrificium*. If it is *hostia pura, sancta, immaculata* after the recital of the narrative, *then so it is at the offertory*, and it is all *sancta sacrificia* in the *Te igitur*. The cup is *calix salutaris* at the offertory—it is no more (*calix salutis*) in the *anamnesis*. It is doing violence to the language to render *hostia* as "offerings" at the

offertory, and then render it "Victim" after the narrative. *Calix salutaris* allows of no such juggling. *Hostia* translated as "Victim" after the narrative of the institution is precisely to fall into an error which all informed catholic opinion has eschewed for many a long year. But despite such unambiguous language, an age which was more interested in the eucharistic presence than in Christ's oblation (and the Church's-in-Christ's) found a perfect focus in the narrative for both attention and ceremonial. From then on, theology was made to keep pace with ceremonial and devotional considerations purely. (In spite of all, the "great elevation" at the end of the *anaphora* still survives in the Roman rite, where the *Ordo Romanus Primus* ordered it.) No longer was the eucharist that which was taken up into the perfect, completed, and ever-living oblation of the Lord. The movement was quite the other way, with all the attendant perils of asserting that "the church *pleads*" Christ's sacrifice. Again, it was no longer the *anaphora* which constituted, gave meaning to, the eucharist: it was the narrative of the institution. The end of this disastrous process we may all see in the rubrics for re-consecration at the end of the 1662 rite.

3. Of what is the eucharist *anamnesis*? The Prayer Book is quite clear here: it is *anamnesis* of the Lord's saving *death* (cf. the Catechism and the prayer of consecration). If the Prayer Book is clear, it is also utterly false to primitive liturgy, to primitive theology, and—faithful as ever to medieval thought.[5] Εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (1 Cor. 11. 25; Luke 22. 20) is perfectly clear—it is *anamnesis* of the Redeemer's whole ministry, in creation, in incarnation, summed and sealed in passion, death, and resurrection. That the author of Hebrews thought of the oblation of Christ in those terms is plain, and nothing has been more destructive of right thinking about the self-offering of Christ than the tendency to confine that offering to the cross. Into the whole oblation of obedience of Son to Father, in creation, in the re-creation of incarnation, passion, death and resurrection-exaltation, the man in Christ is caught up at the eucharist. For where there is re-calling, "making present", *anamnesis*, there *is* Christ, and there is his oblation. It is the Lord's whole work of salvation which is brought into the present, by its effects, in the eucharist: it is emphatically not the passion alone. To all of this, the *Unde et memores* of the Roman rite gives expression, and so do all the revised rites of

Anglicanism. The difficulty of the narrative of the institution remains. It is almost painfully easy, in spite of the *Sursum corda*, to give mental assent to a "presence-come-down" there to be offered to the Father (in defiance of the plain meaning of Hebrews) —and in crude form, to be used as an interposed bribe. But the Roman rite will read perfectly well, and make intelligible liturgy (and theology) *without* the narrative. Here is the excised version (in Mgr Knox's translation):

> We pray thee, God, to make this same offering wholly blessed, to consecrate it and approve it, making it reasonable and acceptable, so that it may become for us the Body and Blood of thy dearly beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. And now, O Lord, we thy servants, and with us all thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed Passion of this same Christ, thy Son, our Lord, likewise his resurrection from the grave, and glorious ascension into heaven, offer to thy sovereign majesty, out of the gifts thou hast bestowed upon us, a sacrifice that is pure, holy, and unblemished, the sacred Bread of everlasting life, and the Cup of eternal salvation. . . .

4. I have said that the centrality of the narrative of the institution blurs, and even masks, the main themes of the New Testament record of salvation. What, in fact, does the New Testament have to say of the work of Christ? The array of thought is almost bewildering in its scope and intensity. The new creation, the new life, the new people, the new man, the new Exodus, pardon and reconciliation, the new age, the gift of the Spirit—whole libraries have been written on any one of those themes. And all that we have in 1662 is the narrative of the institution of the eucharist! But if the tiny fraction which I have given above is all part of the ministry, part of the oblation, of Christ, into which the Church is caught up at the eucharist, then why have we so far been unable to give expression to any of it? The reason is to be found in the adherence to the narrative, to the central position which it holds, and—significantly—to the early divorce between the Church and Judaism. This last thought we must now attempt to develop, in the hope that it will expand and clarify what has been said in this last part of a lengthy section.

Many readers will recall the fascination which the liturgy of Addai and Mari had for the late Dom Gregory Dix, and the total lack in that liturgy of any narrative of the institution. Dom

Gregory very rightly observed that the eucharist prayer of Addai and Mari was given over to the *effects* of redemption, and not to a recital of either the historical events or of the eucharistic institution. It is at this point that we may begin gathering together the strands of which we have been trying to say. In the first place, however soon the Church began making accommodation to the needs of non-Jewish converts, the first liturgical models of the eucharist must have derived from Jewish usage. In this connection, it is of quite vital moment to discover two things: first, the pattern of the Jewish *berakhah*, or "eucharistia", and secondly, the Jewish pattern of *anamnesis* in regard to the passover. As to the first, we are now indebted to the labours of a distinguished Dominican, Fr Audet.[6] In his examination of the matter, Audet distinguishes three stages, or movements, arising from a simple "blessing of the name of God" addressed to a single specific occasion. Fr Audet's three stages can be summarized as follows: First, there is the blessing proper, more or less of a fixed character, which is a call to praise God. The second stage is the *anamnesis*, the re-calling of the mighty acts of God. But this element, the author holds, grew out of the section devoted to motive in the ordinary simple blessings. By the time it is a "stage" in its own right, it is no longer concerned with a particular occasion, or peculiar reason for which God is being (transiently) praised. On the contrary, it passed beyond the first stage to an *anamnesis* of the works of God, first in creation, and then—more importantly—for his works in the making and saving of his people. The third stage is the conclusion, leading into doxology which may often be varied according to the theme of the second stage of the "blessing". At this juncture, the only comment I have to make is that, if the *Sursum corda* corresponds to the first of Audet's three movements, then we have gone sadly astray over the second (giving all the emphasis to the narrative), by almost excluding reference to Messiah's saving work, and the third (for Anglicans) does not exist at all.

We come now to the Jewish manner of *anamnesis* in regard to the rite which enshrines the first Deliverance, the Exodus. In the fully developed rite of Deuteronomy 16 there is a whole catena of rubrics, with a command of *anamnesis* in verse 3 and 12. But in order to discover what the Hebrew was doing in his "re-calling" we have to consult Ex. 13. 8, 14 and Deut. 6. 20 (cf. 32. 7). There is no suggestion anywhere that the keeping of passover demanded a

recital of the narrative of its institution--far from it. The *anamnesis* which passover made was of God's mighty act in delivering his ancient people (and, in Deut. 32. 7ff, of the work of creation, too). All this is most powerfully underlined in the Mishnah's treatment of the rite (Pesachim 10. 6—Danby's edition, p. 151). The reply to the questions of the youngest competent at table almost studiously avoids any narrative of the institution, and goes right to the heart of the matter: "This is done because of that which the Lord did unto *me* when *I* came forth out of Egypt. Not our ancestors alone did God redeem then, but he did *us* redeem with them. . . ." (italics mine). What was of moment was that which was being made new for each generation of God's people. The modern Jewish passover-services betray little interest in the institution of passover: they are passionately concerned with three things, first the Exodus-deliverance as that which constituted Israel, secondly the continued sustaining of Israel-under-God, and third the looking to the expected messianic salvation and day of God.

It is time we paid attention to one of the "cities of Christendom". Rome and Constantinople have enriched all our life, but in the drawing-apart of Jew and Christian Jerusalem has played but little part in our understanding of liturgy. What is urgently demanded is a eucharistic prayer which pays attention to the making of the *plebs sancti dei*, to that whole new age which the New Covenant of Messiah sealed in his blood and resurrection. If the narrative of the institution of the eucharist is to remain in the rite at all—personally I would rather see it go—then it has no call to be treated as more than an authentication-text before the *anaphora*. To begin by "blessing the name of God" in the *Sursum corda* (with a mere occasional preface thrown in) and then lay all the weight on the narrative of institution, with a severely truncated reference to the Messianic work of Jesus in the *Unde et memores* (and that silent in the Roman use) is to lose sight of nearly all of the massive insights of the New and Old Testaments. There is a rich quarry waiting for the liturgist in the Jewish festival prayer-books.

Here and now, in this world, the man-in-Christ is embodied in the messianic community of the new age, and is already in that new creation to which the prophets looked (and to which the Jewish prayer-books still look). The Church of Messiah is the

embodiment of the New Covenant, inaugurated, and yet-to-be-consummated. All of this is the ever-present, eschatological fact which the eucharist "re-calls", makes present reality. To toy with the 1662 rite is poor substitute for looking to the rock whence we were hewn.

[1] By and large, catholics have been guilty of some curious *lacunae* in thinking about the ministry, producing some pieces of popular vocabulary which speak of "my mass, my office, my priesthood". The Orthodox insistence that ordination is not a personal, irrevocable piece of *proprietas*, but a juridical act by which the priestly body appoints some of its members to act in its name, is largely ignored—even if it has been heard of.

[2] I am wholly convinced that there is an expression of the eucharistic oblation, as that which is taken up into the perfect self-offering of Christ, in the rite of 1662 But it is fatally identified with the cross alone, and ultimately hangs on an idea of Christian incorporation as dependent purely on the reception of holy communion. Cf. the position of the Lord's prayer *after* the communion, and the tacit assumptions of the prayer of thanks-giving.

[3] It may well be that the attention paid to the narrative of institution as "consecratory" is allied historically with the emergence of short formulae for emergency baptism.

[4] In most English translations, the language is obscured and even vitiated. The latest edition of the *English Missal* is notoriously bad, whereas Knox is—as one might expect—perfectly correct.

[5] I am not forgetting 1 Cor. 11. 26. But it has here to be linked with the thought of 1 Cor. 1. 23, and the apostle is emphasizing the fact that the Lord had died a real death—he was not a phantasm. This is very properly pointed out by Aulén in his recent *Eucharist and Sacrifice.*

[6] "Literary Forms and Contents of a Normal 'Eucharistia' in the First Century", in *The Gospels Reconsidered* (Blackwell, 1960).

NON-RESIDENCE OF PAROCHIAL CLERGY IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

C. J. GODFREY

The modern age, with its insistence on personal residence by the incumbent, is very severe on the non-resident rectors of the middle ages. In this it has to some extent been encouraged by the strictures of medieval poets and polemical writers. A lurid picture has frequently been obtained of rectors up from the country, singing masses for the dead in St Paul's or other great churches, and enjoying the amenities of the capital while their flocks remain neglected and unshepherded. There were, it is true, outbursts by individual prelates, who ought to have known the facts. Archbishop Sudbury complained of rectors in his diocese who were absent in distant parts without permission, while they farmed out their rectories to men who turned them into taverns. While no one would suggest that abuses did not exist, a contribution to a more balanced picture might perhaps be made by a study of the licences for non-residence contained in some of the more important episcopal registers of the fourteenth century.

The extent to which these dispensations were granted varied with bishops, and on the whole they were issued less frequently towards the close of the century. In considering the numbers of licences granted, the size of dioceses and their geographical situation must also be borne in mind. Walter de Stapledon, who from 1307 to 1326 was bishop of Exeter, a diocese which according to the *Taxatio* of Nicholas IV in 1291 had 529 churches, granted licences to 245 parochial clergy during his episcopate. Many of these had their licences renewed, some of them several times over. It is clear that this bishop regarded licensed absence as respectable, under certain conditions, and indeed as something which could be turned into a source of profit for the benefit of a worthy cause. Stapledon was continuing the work of his predecessors, Bronescombe, Quivil, and Bytton, on the adornment and enlargement of the cathedral church, and the decorated pulpitum and bishop's throne belong to Stapledon's episcopate. Normally each clerk who was granted a non-residence licence was required to contribute half-a-mark to the fabric fund. A high proportion of

the absentees, about 175, received their licences for purposes of study (appropriately enough from the founder of Exeter College, Oxford). As we shall see, study continued to be the chief reason, or excuse, for absence throughout the century, in almost all dioceses.

In an equally remote part of the country, about the same time as Stapledon's episcopate, we find a similarly generous granting of licences. Thomas Corbridge, archbishop of York (1300-4, 625 churches), permitted 60 parochial clerks to be absent, while his successor William Greenfield (1306-15) licensed 134. Elsewhere, Sandale and Asserio, respectively bishops of Winchester (338 churches) from 1316 to 1319 and from 1320 to 1323, during this short period issued 87 licences. Simon de Gandavo (Salisbury 1297-1315, 493 churches) issued no fewer than 343, many of them however simply renewals. Walter Reynolds while bishop of Worcester (1308-13, 335 churches) granted 104 licences to 68 clerks, mostly for study. Henry Woodlock, bishop of Winchester (1305-16), gave 116, 105 of them for study. Swinfield, who was at Hereford (291 churches) from 1283 to 1317, granted 67, and his successor Orleton (1317-27), 72. Halton, bishop of Carlisle (1292-1324), a small diocese with only 94 churches, granted 35 (to 27 different clerks). Bishop Halton was generous in the amount of time for which he allowed his clergy to be absent, licences frequently being for five or seven years. London (459 churches) apparently did not favour non-residence nearly so much, but probably its clergy did not hanker after it as did the remotely situated country clergy. In the London registers of Baldock, Segrave, Newport, and Gravesend, covering the years 1304-38, there are only three licences, all for study, and all granted by Baldock (1306-13). Hamo de Hethe, bishop of Rochester (108 churches), during his lengthy episcopate (1319-52) issued 59 (43 for study) according to his register.

The study of non-residence licences is however complicated by the lack of them in some registers and dioceses where it is virtually certain that non-residence must have been permitted. Thus in the register of Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury (1315-30), there are hardly any, though this bishop like his predecessor Simon de Gandavo was a scholar and would be likely to encourage regulated absence for study. In this register there is also a total absence of ordinations and there are very few visitation records,

and yet no one would suggest that ordinations and visitations did not take place. In the margins there are occasional notes of cross reference to the "Roll of Dispensations" and to the "Roll of Visitations", now lost. In any case, a licence for non-residence, unlike the record of an institution to a benefice, was unlikely to be needed as evidence in a lawsuit many years after it was granted. The practice of registrars must have varied in different dioceses, and under different registrars in the same diocese. It is clear therefore that these licences must always be approached with a certain amount of caution, though it is possible to arrive at some broad conclusions from an analysis of the very large number of recorded licences which actually exist.

I

The high proportion of dispensations granted for study leads us to believe that a great deal of such learning as came the way of the parochial clergy was obtained in this way. Of Simon de Gandavo's 343 licences 303 were for study, and it appears that a widely practised custom was for a cleric to be instituted to a rectory and use the revenues virtually as a studentship or scholarship. This heavy preponderance of study-licences is fairly general, but less so towards the end of the century. Of the 24 licences recorded in the register of Langham, archbishop of Canterbury (1366-8), only 7 are for study, and of the 273 licences of Brantyngham (Exeter 1370-94) only 86. The bishops themselves had frequently benefited in the early stages of their careers from the system, as when Gandavo received leave of absence in 1280 from archbishop Wickwane, when he was rector of Wilford, Notts., to study for three years.

It is possible, without drawing any clear lines, to distinguish between three main classes of student-absentee. In the first place there are the young clerics who have obtained their first benefice, and proceed to a course of study at some centre of learning. In these cases the benefice was in effect a scholarship, and indeed was the only contemporary form of "scholarship" in the modern sense, that is to say, a provision for the support of undergraduates. There are many instances (as in Greenfield's register) of a clerk being instituted to a rectory, and granted a licence to study the same day or very shortly afterwards. The presumption is that most of these clerks were quite young men. In the second place, there are

ordinary incumbents who after some years in their parish, perhaps in middle life, go off to read for a year or two. Some of these may have genuinely wished to acquire knowledge useful to them in their calling. Others, wearied with the tedium of medieval village life, doubtless saw in a so-called study-licence an opportunity for a pleasant stay in a university or cathedral city. The third group are those incumbents who are more or less "professional" students, men often or usually styled *magistri*, and repeatedly, sometimes habitually, absent from their parishes, though it must not be assumed that all *magistri* are in this category.

The existence of these professional students as a distinct and recognized class of incumbents is often indicated, as when Grandisson (Exeter 1327-69) grants a block of licences at the same time to eight graduate rectors for study at Oxford or elsewhere; all the eight have had licences previously, and the manner of the entry suggests that we have here a group of mature scholars. In Stapledon's register, out of the 175 non-resident beneficed parochial clergy absent for study, there seem to be about 35 serious students. Such are John de Wytebi, rector of Holne, Philip, rector of Moreton Hampstead, and Nicholas Walwayn, rector of South Tawton, all three of them Devonshire rural incumbents. The first had repeated licences for study from 1310 to 1321; he is *magister* from the beginning. The second had study-licences renewed on and off for several years; his first licence is in 1309, by 1318 he is *magister*, and his licences include specific permission to attend the university of Paris. The third received a study-licence for two years, renewed for a third year with the stipulation that his church and parish be provided for more carefully; later he was granted another three years if he wished to study abroad, or one year if he proposed to remain in England. The subjects of study of such students as these, when mentioned, are in all the registers nearly always theology or canon law.

The subject of study proposed by the humbler licensees is not usually mentioned, and it is likely that a high proportion of these men simply went off to improve their basic education. Oxford is usually the place of learning mentioned, Cambridge but rarely and then normally only as an alternative to Oxford. It is obvious however that not as many men went to Oxford, relatively to other centres of learning, as the licences might at first sight suggest. The stock formula, *in scolis Oxonie vel alibi in Anglia ubi viget studium*

generale simply indicates the pre-eminence of Oxford at this time. Many of the absentees probably went on the strength of their licences to the cathedral school of their diocese or even to more local schools, like the rector of Wimborne St Giles, Dorset, who had leave to study at Marlborough, *cum magistro scolarum*. Such phrases as *in scolis et extra—loco, tamen, honesto—interim moram facere*, and *ubicumque in regno Anglia; locis, tamen, congruis et honestis*, especially frequent in Grandisson's register, point to the wide variety of schools to which non-resident rectors were wont to resort, and suggest that there were some educational establishments of which that great prelate had a poor opinion. But in view of the high price of books, and the consequent difficulty of assembling a private library, it must seldom have been possible for a country parson to read seriously unless present, if only for periods, in some urban centre where academic facilities were available.

2

Large numbers of non-resident rectors were in the service of prominent or influential people, and it may well be that the usefulness of the clergy to such persons was a main reason for the continuance of non-residence in so regular a form despite the protests of reforming prelates. Thus of the 44 recorded licences of John de Sandale (Winchester 1316-9), 12 are for service rendered to a variety of people, including the archbishop of Lyons and other ecclesiastics. An interesting one is that granted to John Pembroke, rector of St Michael's, Southampton, that he might attend the Lady Mary, daughter of the late Edward I, then a nun at Amesbury, a house of the Order of Fontevrault. Subsequently she obtained the services of Walter de Mursele, rector of Clanfield. Of his 43 licences, Sandale's successor Asserio gave 15 for service, granted to rectors who entered the service of various notables including the king himself, the bishops of Exeter and of Bath and Wells, and Mag. Gilbert de Middletone, Official of the Court of Canterbury, who had three rectors licensed to him on the same day. In Stapledon's episcopate, of the 245 licensed non-residents, slightly over 30 were engaged in service. Usually the person served was a member of the gentry, often a noble lady, but amongst those who were served by absentee rectors of Stapledon's diocese were the archbishop of York (William de Melton), the dean and chapter of Wells, the abbess of Barking, the bishop of St David's, and the

archbishop of Armagh. In Walter de Bodekysham, rector of St Dominic, we have a cleric who makes a speciality of serving gentlemen. In succession he serves Sir Richard de Grey, Kt. (two years), John de Somery (two years), Mag. William de Birstone, archdeacon of Gloucester (eighteen months), and Sir William de Norwich, Kt. (eighteen months). He clearly has some particular qualification which is valuable to such men. The nunnery of Canonsleigh is an instance of a religious house which utilized livings in its gift to secure the services of non-resident clergymen. In 1317 John de Mareschal, rector of Little Hempston, of which the abbess and convent were patrons, obtained leave to stay at the nunnery, and in 1324 a later rector of the same parish was granted a licence to remain in the service of the abbey.

Of the 525 licences of Stapledon's successor Grandisson, about 70 are for service. A dozen licences are granted to incumbents for royal service, notably for work *in saccario*. How the king would use benefices in his gift to secure the services of useful men is illustrated by the case of Robert Clappysale, rector of Ipplepen. The patronage of this rectory belonged to the small alien priory in the same place, dependent on St Pierre de Rillé. Owing to the French war the gift was in the king's hands, and on 16 August 1340 Clappysale was instituted, on the presentation of Edward III. On 12 September he received letters dimissory for all minor and holy orders, and on 2 November licence of non-residence for one year, *causa insistendi obsequiis domini nostri regis*. Of the other licences granted by Grandisson for service, about 30 are for the benefit of aristocratic households. In two cases a rector is licensed for the service of an abbess, while a few dispensations are for incumbents in the service of some important ecclesiastic. One incumbent has leave of absence to act as an executor to the late bishop Stapledon.

Grandisson however was of the reforming school of prelates, and during the course of his episcopate proceeded to set his face against non-residence until he eventually attempted to put a stop to it altogether. In this connection his episcopate divides itself conveniently into three periods of fourteen years each. During the first fourteen years, according to his register, he granted 472 licences. Then he suddenly tightened up his policy, and during the next fourteen years only 53 were issued, of which 27 were to *magistri*. He had apparently become uneasy about the propriety of rectors, except those who were genuine scholars, being allowed to leave

their flocks. And then in September 1355 he issued a mandate to his Official Principal and Archdeacons, concerning beneficed clergy, *animarum curam habentes, presertim quibus claves ecclesie committuntur, velut pastores solliciti, supra gregem sibi commissum vigilare et noctis custodire vigilias teneantur.* . . . The bishop is sorry to say that in his diocese there are those who instead of remaining in their cures, prefer to dress themselves in gorgeous livery in the service of great lords, while those who cannot secure such employment nevertheless live dissolutely. There is to be no more non-residence in future. The impression one receives from the register is that the bishop was as good as his word; after the mandate there were no further dispensations recorded, not even for study. It must be remembered however that no bishop could normally refuse a request from a rector who could put up a strong case for being absent for study, without himself acting illegally, in view of the papal constitution, *Quum ex eo*. In the closing years of his episcopate Grandisson must have continued to grant licences for study, though grudgingly and perhaps mainly to serious scholars, his registrar either omitting to record them, or keeping them (as is more likely) on a separate quire of parchment which has since been lost.

Grandisson's specific objection was to his parochial clergy being employed for secular purposes by great lords, who however found their services too valuable to forego indefinitely. The next bishop of Exeter, Thomas de Brantyngham (1370-94), was at once confronted with requests for non-residence, which he was only too ready to grant, in complete reversal of his predecessor's policy. Of his 273 licences, 86 are for study, 76 for no specified reason, while no fewer than 100 are given for services to be rendered to the higher clergy, aristocracy, gentry, or at their request. Brantyngham had held high office in the State, and he was the type of prelate who might be expected to grant licences for secular service more readily than reformers like Grandisson. The disregard of the other members of the episcopate for Grandisson's prohibitive measures might be shown by the substantial number who now proceeded to make use of the services of absentee rectors of the Exeter diocese in Brantyngham's episcopate. We find the bishops of Hereford, Ely, St David's, Chichester, doing so, along with William of Wykeham (Winchester), William Courtenay (London), and Simon Sudbury (Canterbury)—who had a special liking for one John Christmas,

rector of Blisland. Mag. Humphrey Charlton, archdeacon of Richmond, in an illness called on the services of Mag. John Landreyn, rector of St Mawgan-in-Kerrier, though in what capacity, medical or otherwise, is not stated.

It is apparent, in fact, that regularized non-residence made possible many of the professional services to society which have long since become independent of the clerical order. A clerk might be used generally as a trusted household servant like John de Galmyngton, rector of Little Torrington, who was licensed for the benefit of Sir John de Wellington, Kt. Or he might be useful in a specialized capacity, as was Mag. John de Fonte, rector of Kirkby Ereblawers, physician to queen Margaret, in 1310.

3

Study and service of various kinds account for most of the licences for which a specific reason is given, and as a rule the reason is actually stated. The dispensations for absence are formal and precise documents. The remainder are given for reasons which are various and not seldom curious. Rectors might be granted absence to visit their relations or while the parsonage-house is undergoing repairs, for purposes of litigation connected with the benefice, because of debts contracted by predecessors, or even because the climate is damp. Now and again we read of an incumbent granted leave of absence through illness, but the normal way of dealing with this difficulty was by the appointment of a coadjutor.

Few dispensations are recorded which were granted to allow the recipient to go on pilgrimage. There is something of a crop of them in and around 1300, the Jubilee Year of Boniface VIII, though even here the number is quite small. The Salisbury clergy were well to the fore in seeking the indulgence to be obtained by making the Jubilee pilgrimage, eleven licences being allowed by Gandavo; but Corbridge of York only granted three for the whole of his great diocese. Neither Swinfield of Hereford, nor Halton of Carlisle, both of whose episcopates covered the Jubilee Year, granted any licences for pilgrimage. Applications to make this pilgrimage could hardly have been refused by any bishop, and we must assume that the journey was far too expensive a one for the average parochial clergyman to contemplate, or again that such licences were not usually registered. Later in the century, we find Grandisson issuing

16 pilgrimage licences (out of his total of 525), mostly to Rome, in some cases combined with business there. Some are for visits to St James of Compostella. There is one licence by Grandisson for an incumbent to visit the shrine of St Thomas of Canterbury and then proceed to that of St Mary Magdalen in Provence. One Nottinghamshire incumbent goes off to visit the tomb of the late revered William Wickwane, archbishop of York, in Pontigny.

But if these pilgrimage-licences do not illuminate this aspect of medieval devotion so much as we should wish, they at least throw the spotlight on to one side of the whole problem of non-residence, namely the virtual monopoly of licences as a whole by rectors. Pilgrimage appears to have been the only cause for which a vicar could normally obtain leave of absence. Of the 343 licences issued by Gandavo, only two went to vicars, both to visit Rome in the Jubilee Year. One of these is reminded that he must not dally in Rome, but get back as quickly as possible. Nothing could illustrate more clearly the fundamental difference between rectors and vicars. The practical distinguishing mark of a vicar was not his low stipend compared with that of a rector—indeed vicars were sometimes paid better than rectors—but his definite obligation to reside personally. During Gandavo's episcopate no licences for non-resident study were granted to vicars, though the number of vicars was large, and it must not be assumed that they were all incapable and ignorant. Even so good a scholar as Mag. William de Pagula, instituted vicar of Winkfield near Windsor in 1314, with the usual charges of personal residence, does not seem to have been non-resident. There is, at any rate, no recorded licence of absence in his favour, in a register which contains large numbers of such licences.

In archbishop Corbridge's register three of the four pilgrimage-licences are for vicars (the fourth is for a canon of the Augustinian priory of Healough Park, in West Yorkshire), and indeed the archbishop seems to have been in some doubt at first as to whether vicars might be absent even to visit Rome for the Holy Year. Although he granted a licence on 20 July 1300 to Robert, vicar of Thorpaches, to visit Rome, he cancelled it on discovering that the applicant was a vicar. He apparently soon changed his view in connection with this point, for on 30 August 1300 he granted a pilgrimage-licence to William, vicar of Carnaby. There are also one or two casual references in this register, independently of licences, to Rome pilgrimage. In general, the pilgrimage-licences in all the

registers, where they occur, are for pilgrimage overseas, and it seems pretty clear that dispensation was not required for pilgrimage within England.

The strict attitude towards vicars in the matter of non-residence is also maintained in the register of Greenfield, who out of 168 licences gave only one to a vicar, who was allowed an absence of two months for benfice business. Again, in Stapledon's episcopate, of the 245 separate parochial incumbents who received licences, only four were vicars, though there were 140 vicarages in the Exeter diocese at the time, as against rather more than 300 rectories. When Bernard de Kyrkeby, vicar of Northon in the diocese of Durham, required non-residence, it was found necessary to seek papal permission, although he was almoner to the king. Bishop Brantyngham of Exeter granted only three licences to vicars out of a total of 273, one for pilgrimage, one for litigation concerning repairs to the chancel, books, and ornaments of the church, and a wholly unusual dispensation of three years' absence for Walter Cotel, vicar of Elerky, Cornwall, that he might teach in the grammar school of Crediton.

4

Regular licences to rectors were commonly for one or two years duration, and in many cases for three years. The licence usually expired at Michaelmas. Occasionally a licence was given for the maximum period of seven years, and some bishops were very generous in this respect. The licence was often renewed, but it is scarcely to be assumed, in spite of the emphatic and strongly worded *Quum ex eo*, that licences were awarded lightly to all and sundry who applied for them. This might depend on the generosity or policy of the bishop, on the needs and circumstances of the applicant, or even on the amount of influence which the latter might have behind him. Amongst the many privileged young men we find James, rector of Kirby Underdale, who has a licence for seven years' study, at the request of his father, who is the archbishop of York's "very dear friend". Corbridge again shows his tender feelings for the well-connected when he gives notice to his Official to postpone proceedings against Humfrey, rector of Harewood, for non-residence, who also has an indignant father to speak up for him. His father, like Sir Walter de Beauchamp, was brother to the earl of Warwick.

But though it is clear that licences were not necessarily to be obtained by ordinary parsons simply for the asking, it is, on the other hand, perfectly clear that there was more non-residence than the recorded licences actually suggest. It might be that there were occasional causes which the bishops were prepared to accept as excuse for unofficial absence. Thus Peter Poleyn, rector of Gussage St Michael, Dorset, was appointed commissary to Henry Woodlock, bishop of Winchester, in 1305, though there is no record in Gandavo's register of a non-residence licence for him. There are, too, many notices by diocesans to their officials not to molest non-resident rectors, nor to sequestrate their revenues. Conversely, the extent of unauthorized absence is shown by Brantyngham's repeated mandates to his archdeacons and rural deans to order offenders to return. In an exceptionally strongly worded mandate he called on his officials in Devon and Cornwall that they admonish rectors and vicars absent without permission to return to their parishes. Because of their negligence, *in populo vicia pululant, divinus cultus diminuitur, hospitalitas retrahitur, edificia collabuntur, et gravia scandala suscitantur, ac, prochdolor, anime ad quorum salutem spirituales medici deputantur, evidentibus periculis exponuntur.* To his official of Exeter, the bishop stated that non-residence of incumbents having cure of souls is forbidden by canon law, *nisi de licentia prelatorum suorum, ex causa studiorum literarum, vel pro aliis honestis causis.* In a mandate to the dean of Christianity in Exeter, 14 offending clergy were listed, eight of them rectors of that city.

Licences were not granted without conditions, and the diocesan was nearly always careful to ensure that the parish did not suffer. In the first place it was necessary that the applicant appoint a proctor, usually a neighbouring cleric, who could officially represent him during his absence. The non-resident was also required to ensure the continuance of accustomed alms and hospitality, a traditional charge on the benefice. The bishop often stipulated that the incumbent be back in his parish for Holy Week and the greater festivals, though there was no general rule about this, and where the bishop made such a condition he seems to have fitted it to suit the individual case. One absentee is directed to be in his parish during the Christmas vacation as well as Holy Week; another is to reside during Advent and Lent. The most important and constant stipulation however is that providing for the maintenance of the

spiritual ministrations, as when the rector of the Dorset parish of Corfe Castle, on going off to the university, is ordered to ensure that his parishioners are not deprived of their church services. By this something more was meant than one or two services each Sunday. The principle of the daily office, sung or said publicly in church, was firmly established. For such ministrations a resident priest was essential. When Grandisson granted leave of absence for a fortnight to the vicar of Widecombe-in-the-Moor, on 24 May 1334, for benefice business, he stipulated that even for this short time the services were to be maintained. And when in November 1302 Philip de Cantuaria, rector of Rushall, Wilts., was given licence of a year for study at Oxford or elsewhere, it was on condition that he present a chaplain by no later than St Peter's Chains (1 August). Meanwhile the cure could not be neglected for so many months, which included the Feasts of Christmas and Easter, and a temporary curate was admitted. There can be no doubt that the qualifications of most of these curates were very poor. Such men represented the tail end of the clerical profession. Nevertheless, some effort was made, if only occasionally, to ensure that they had reached a certain standard. Thus we find Simon de Gandavo examining one of these men, John de Norton, appointed chaplain of Blunsdon during the absence of the rector while engaged in study, and admitting him to the curacy having decided that he was sufficiently lettered.

Such a cleric, always a priest, is specifically styled a "curate", and the entries recording admission to their duties form a special feature of Gandavo's register. When the rector of Christian Malford goes away to study for two years, he presents William de Tytcombe to the curacy. The latter is admitted on 11 September 1301, *si aliquem non posset habere meliorem*. On 8 June 1306 Thomas de Baudak becomes curate of Swindon, *dum tamen interim se bene habeat et honeste*. There was available a large supply of these clerical hacks, these casual labourers of the Church, and such intermittent employment was no doubt all that many could hope for. In Gandavo's register there are 27 entries of admissions to curacies—23 of them in parishes where the rector was a licensed non-resident.

Financial conditions are not usually attached to dispensations for absence, though they are not entirely unknown. We have already noted the practice of bishop Stapledon in requiring a contribution to the Exeter fabric fund. There are three cases in

Gandavo's episcopate of non-resident parsons being required to pay 20 shillings to a convent of nuns by way of compensation. That it was perhaps not impossible for the diocesan himself to make something out of the transactions is evidenced by the official who is to inquire whether the archbishop of York would be justified in granting leave to Mag. John de Dalton to take a lease of Swillington rectory for three years from the incumbent, Dalton paying the archbishop two marks a year. Of more interest, in the same register, is Peter de Columbers, rector of Shelton, who obtained licence for a year's study on 7 March 1301. It appears that he displeased the archbishop by failing to obtain priest's orders, though the upshot was that on 21 March he was sent away to study not for one year but for seven. He was to be ordained priest within that period, and receive from the fruits of his church £5 a year. The residue was to be awarded to some poor scholar. On 26 March the archbishop selected Adam de Spiriden, who was succeeded in his share of the Shelton revenues by Mag. William of York on 1 September 1304, described as "a poor clerk". Meanwhile, on 20 June 1301 the farm of the church had been granted to the archdeacon of Nottingham, who was to pay to Peter his £5 promptly each year, the residue to Spiriden, and maintain the buildings as he found them.

But from the cleric's own standpoint perhaps the most important condition attached to a dispensation for non-residence was the reception of major or "holy" orders. Large numbers of clergymen in acolytes' orders were rectors, but such as desired non-residence were almost invariably required to enter the subdiaconate. This entailed the vow of celibacy, and the bishops were thus at least able to ensure that those who used benefice revenues for primarily personal advantages were made to identify themselves with the peculiar sacrifices of the clerical order.

It would be easy to condemn the whole system of regularized non-residence by taking up the viewpoint of a critic judging by modern standards. One can of course see the evils, and even in the fourteenth century others besides Grandisson probably sensed the inherent absurdity of the system. There were disadvantages and undoubtedly a good many parishes suffered. Yet the system was inevitable both because of the concentration of so much of the national wealth in the revenues of parochial benefices, and so high a proportion of intellectual talent amongst the clergy. John

Wycliffe, it may be remembered, could scarcely have done his work in the world without being a non-resident incumbent. The parochial clergy of the fourteenth century as a class, however, were hardly recognized by their contemporaries as an educated body of men, and without licensed absence for purposes of study they might well have lapsed into a state of rustic ignorance which would have brought utter contempt upon their calling. The crucial point here is probably the high price of books. In spite of the evidence of wills which points to books in clerical possession, it is on the whole likely that even the smallest of libraries must have been exceedingly rare in country parsonages. Broadly speaking, the licensed absentees were probably the only parochial clergy who ever saw the inside of a university and enjoyed the advantages of disciplined reading and instruction.

The second great class of absentees, those engaged in specialized service, were essential to a society which resented the payment of taxes and regarded the wealth of the Church as a fund on which it could draw. Altogether, the identification of the forces, and the agents, of Christianity at this time with the secular world was to the benefit of the latter, though it contributed in no small degree to the upheavals which lay a few generations ahead, and in which the Church would be the chief sufferer. The non-resident rector may have had the best of both worlds, but he can hardly be blamed for a society which saw in him a necessary instrument of its whole system.

A TRAP TO CATCH CALVINISTS

(Or, Bishop Marsh's Eighty-Seven Questions)

ARTHUR POLLARD

HERBERT MARSH, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in early nineteenth-century Cambridge and sometime bishop of Peterborough, is an attractively unpleasant because incurably quarrelsome character. Of course, he defended his behaviour. "That I have been frequently engaged in controversy, I cannot deny. But they have never been controversies of my own seeking, except when I have defended the *State*, and defended the *Church*."[1] This self-appointed apologist even cast himself in the rôle of prospective martyr, suggesting before the House of Lords that it was not "improbable that the fate which attended Archbishop Laud would befall the bishop of Peterborough, if the same party should again obtain the ascendancy in the church".[2]

Marsh's life (1757-1839) was almost exactly contemporaneous with that of Charles Simeon, and much of it was spent in Cambridge and in prolonged controversy with Simeon and other Evangelicals. His first polemic was with Archdeacon Travis about certain Greek manuscripts. In 1799 he published a defence of British policies prior to the country's entering the French Revolutionary Wars. This was written originally in German and served a strong propagandist purpose in Europe at the time, so much so that Marsh had to hide from Napoleon's agents. He was at the time in Leipzig where he had spent many years studying under Michaelis, the pioneer scholar in biblical criticism. Between 1793 and 1801 Marsh published his translation of Michaelis' writings, and this in its turn produced yet more controversy, this time with Randolph, the bishop of Oxford. Marsh became Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in 1807 and his lectures and writings over the next twenty years were devoted to questions of biblical criticism, authenticity, and interpretation. He also took part in the dispute about the relative merits of the Bell and Lancaster systems of education, defending the Anglican Bell; and in 1814 he published *A Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome*. He was later to oppose Catholic Emancipation. His staunch Anglicanism also led to his opposing the Bible Society. In 1812 he

published *An Inquiry into the Consequences of neglecting to give the Prayer Book with the Bible*. This was intended as a rebuke for those Anglicans who associated with Dissenters in the inter-denominational constitution of the Bible Society. These Anglicans were Evangelicals, and the proposal to establish the Cambridge Auxiliary of the Bible Society in 1811 provided the opportunity for Marsh to reopen the skirmishing in his prolonged running fight with the Cambridge Evangelicals. This appears to have begun in 1805 when Marsh preached before the University and was answered by Simeon. In the 1812-13 outburst Marsh was answered by Simeon and Isaac Milner and by others such as Nicholas Vansittart and William Dealtry. The opposition was overwhelming, and in his reply to Milner Marsh announed his intention of withdrawing from the fight, not because he had lost faith in his cause, but in an attitude of heroic isolation, seeing himself as a kind of last representative of sanity in a mad world. In the Conclusion of his *Reply to the Strictures of the Rev. Isaac Milner* he announced the withdrawal of his opposition to the Bible Society, which being "supported with all the fervour of religious enthusiasm . . . an attempt to *oppose* it, is like attempting to oppose a torrent of burning lava that issues from Etna or Vesuvius". Indeed, he felt even self-defence of dubious worth: "I stand opposed, not only to Dr. Milner, and all the *minor* advocates of the Society; I stand opposed to almost every periodical publication, from the Edinburgh Review down to the Christian Observer; to say nothing of the Evangelical Magazine, and the other broods of methodism, which are hatched at the expiration of every month, and peck by instinct at the Margaret Professor."[3] One must at least grant Marsh a skilful line in sarcasm. In 1816 he was preferred to the see of Llandaff and three years later he was translated to Peterborough.

It was here that the trouble with his Calvinistic clergy began. In his Primary Charge in 1820 Marsh expressed his intention of inquiring into the doctrinal soundness of curates seeking licences in his diocese.[4] He proposed to do so by means of the Eighty-Seven Questions, the soon-to-be notorious trap to catch Calvinists. The first victim was John Green who was refused entry to the curacy of Blatherwyke (Northants) in June 1820 for refusing to answer the questions. After prolonged negotiation the Archbishop of Canterbury ruled for Marsh's right as diocesan to conduct the examination, but Henry Nevile, rector of Blatherwyke, laid a

petition before the House of Lords. This was debated in June 1821, when, although the petition was finally rejected, Marsh had to face the opposition of Lords Calthorpe and Harrowby, Earl Grey and the Marquis of Lansdowne, and, in addition, found none of his fellow-bishops to support him. A year later a second petition was laid before the House of Lords, this time on behalf of T. S. Grimshawe, rector of Biddenham (Beds.) who complained of Marsh's refusal to licence Edward Thurtell to the curacy of Burton Latimer. This time the petition was received and laid on the table, but no further action was taken. In the two debates Marsh displayed all his polemical brilliance, but at this stage he met a controversialist more brilliant than himself. In a devastating article on "Persecuting Bishops" in *The Edinburgh Review* Sydney Smith tore Marsh's case to shreds. In the course of his defence Marsh had stated that over seventy curates had answered his questions and only three had been rejected. Taking this up, Smith wrote: "His Lordship boasts that he has excluded only two curates. So the Emperor of Hayti boasted that he had only cut off two person's heads for disagreeable behaviour at his table. In spite of the paucity of the visitors executed, the example operated as a considerable impediment to conversation; and the intensity of the punishment was found to be a full compensation for its rarity."

What were the questions which caused all this fuss? They fall under nine heads or chapters, dealing respectively with redemption by Jesus Christ, original sin, free will, justification, everlasting salvation, predestination, regeneration, renovation, and the Holy Trinity. Within each chapter the sequence is such that succeeding questions presumed certain predetermined answers to previous questions; that is, they are leading questions. This was one cause of complaint against the questions,[5] and Marsh himself did not deny this tendency.[6] In addition, assistance towards what Marsh considered to be the right answer was given by references to texts of Scripture and the Thirty-Nine Articles. As Nevile put it in his *Remarks on a pamphlet entitled 'A Speech (etc.)'*: "The satisfactory Answer, or as is the case in most instances, the only direct Answer which can be returned, to each Question, could not be more intelligently intimated to the person who is required to return it, if it were literally written for him with pencil to be traced over by him in it."[7] The third objection was to Marsh's requirement, as he put it, for instance, to Thurtell that he wanted

"nothing more than short, plain and positive answers; such are the answers which have hitherto been given to my questions, and such I expect from every one".[8] If the matter of the answer was such as Marsh expected, then perhaps the brevity he expected might also be provided; but, as Lord Dacre said in the 1822 debate, "What the bishop called plain questions involved some of the most intricate and controversial points of theology".[9] In his reply Marsh sought to discredit Thurtell by giving the latter's offer to send more explanation if it was wanted, after he had written ten folio pages on the first answer.[10] But ten folio pages on one answer were better than rationing, as Sidney Smith put it, of "two inches to original sin; an inch and a half to justification; three quarters to predestination; and to free will only a quarter of an inch". Smith went on: "His Lordship is himself a theological writer, and by no means remarkable for his conciseness."

But is the whole controversy anything more than a rather spectacular demonstration of episcopal irascibility? I suggest that it is. It brings to a head the conflict that Simeon had been fighting for over forty years. Moreover, Marsh was by far the most competent of the opponents of Evangelicalism both as scholar and theologian. Let us therefore look more closely at the Questions themselves.

The import of the first chapter—"Of Redemption by Jesus Christ"—is to stress the universality of God's offer of salvation and the theoretical possibility that all men may accept that offer. The second chapter contrasts the view of mankind as "a mass of mere corruption, or of absolute or entire depravity" on the one hand with that which sees him only as "very *far gone* from original righteousness, and of our own nature *inclined* to evil" on the other (Q.1.). In Chapter III Marsh acknowledges that even free will exists only through the grace of God (Q.2), but he is really concerned to reject the view that "man has *no* share in the work of his own salvation" (Q. 5). The fourth chapter on justification distinguishes between this condition and that of everlasting salvation. Justification comes before good works (Sect. I, Q. 2, referring to Articles XII and XIII) and is equated by Marsh with being accounted righteous before God and with admission to the Christian covenant. By this argument justification is considered as taking place at baptism. Justification is by faith, but Marsh goes on in his chapter to claim that everlasting salvation is the result of good works pro-

ceeding from a lively faith. In this chapter also he makes play with the sixteenth Article's reference to departing from grace, falling into sin and rising again and amending our lives. "Does it not thus imply that we may *not* arise again and amend our lives? Does it not then follow, from the sixteenth Article, that justification leads not of necessity to everlasting salvation?" (Qns. 9 (part) and 10.) Salvation, Marsh claims, is not free of obligation on our part, but is freely given of God (Q. 12). In the sixth chapter he argues that it is those who "walk religiously in good works" who are predestined to eternal life, whilst in the seventh he asserts that regeneration takes place at baptism and cannot therefore occur at any other time. In the eighth, however, he considers renovation, the daily renewing by the spirit, an activity apprehended, he insists, only *post facto* in its effects. The last chapter is a desultory affair of four short questions on the Trinity, probably inserted to take care of any crypto-Socinians or Unitarians who might try to infiltrate into the diocese of Peterborough.

Many critics of the Eighty-Seven Questions were doubtful of their legality or at any rate of Marsh's wisdom in invoking legality, but with these arguments I do not here propose to concern myself. I shall concentrate exclusively on the theological interest of the Questions. One can see what special tenets and attitudes of Calvinistic Evangelicalism Marsh had in mind—predestination, election, total depravity, conversion, final perseverance, and the sensible manifestations of religious experience. In his *Reply to the Strictures of the Rev. Isaac Milner* (1813) Marsh had declared: "My opinions are as decidedly anti-calvinistic, on the subject of predestination and grace, as it is possible for opinions to be",[11] and a few pages later: "The anti-Calvinists on the subject of Predestination *deny* this absolute decree; they assert, that God's eternal decree, in regard to eternity and reprobation, was founded on his *foreknowledge of what his creatures would do*."[12] This has repercussions on the doctrine of election. Marsh rejects the doctrine of particular election and exalts that of free will, especially as it respects the ability to perform good works. Here, of course, Marsh is also thrusting at what he considered to be the antinomian implications of Calvinistic views. In the chapter on free will he asks: "Has not the doctrine that man himself has no share in the work of his own salvation, a tendency to make him indifferent in regard to his *moral conduct*?" (III. 13), and again in the chapter

on predestination: "If we believe, that in respect to a future state, neither our good conduct can excite any reasonable hope, nor our bad conduct any reasonable fear, is there any thing beyond the dread of *temporal* punishment to deter us from the commission of crimes?" (VI. 7). This sort of reason which prevented Marsh from accepting Calvinistic views on predestination and election obviously prevented him also from accepting the doctrine of final perseverance.[13] His insistence on good works meant, too, that he could not accept total depravity; man had to be capable of doing good of his own free will. In all this Marsh was (and let us acknowledge the sincerity and nobility of his intention) intent upon emphasizing individual moral responsibility. Such thoroughgoing good-works theories, however, often run into difficulties when the attempt is made to reconcile them with the operations of the prevenient and omnipotent grace of God. Marsh's was no exception in this respect.

It is not surprising therefore that he runs into difficulties with conversion, justification, regeneration, salvation, and faith. At various points he suggests in turn that all are justified (I. 2), that only believers are justified (IV. ii. 1), and that only the baptized are justified (IV. iii. 3 and VII. 3.) Earlier in the *Reply to Milner* he had more deliberately and unequivocally linked baptism and justification. There he wrote that the description of justification in Article XI "suggests the description, which is given in the Catechism of the *Spiritual Grace* conferred at baptism. The former is called the being 'accounted righteous before God'; the latter is represented as 'a new birth unto righteousness'." He then went on to state that neither justification nor baptism requires good works before the event but both require them after it, and he referred also to Article XVI "of which the *subject* is *Sin* after *Justification* and the *title* is "*Sin* after *Baptism*' ".[14] It would appear therefore that Justification equals Baptism which in its turn equals Regeneration.

Where then is the place for faith, and what sort of faith is required? This is where Marsh's fear of sensible experience comes into full view. Again, the *Reply to Milner* is helpful. There we read: "If the Knowledge of this calling (i.e. to salvation) be left to our own *feelings*, or to the workings of our own *imaginations*, a door is instantly opened to all the dreamings of fanatics, to sudden impulses, divine illuminations, inward assurances, and experimental conviction."[15] Hence the question: "Does the assistance

which we receive from the Holy Spirit display itself by sensible impulses, or do we discover this assistance only from the *effects* which it produces?" (VIII. 2); hence also the suggestion in the chapter on predestination: "Is not such a belief injurious also to the *individual*, as well as to society at large, by exciting ungrounded hopes in the confident hypocrite, and driving modest virtue to despair?" (VI. 9). Because Marsh believes in the justification of all who are baptized, he gets into difficulties about faith. Much of the fifth chapter is spent in the attempt to extricate himself from these difficulties. Everlasting salvation is the rendering to man of his reward for his good works (V. 14-16), and these works are the evidence of a true and lively faith, but not all who are admitted to the Christian covenant show forth such works because they have not such faith. If, therefore, justification is admission to the Christian covenant (cf. V. 1) and if it comes about by faith in the merits of Christ (ibid.), it would appear that this faith, not being always productive of that fruit which is wanted to remain within the Christian covenant (V. 3), must be something other than the lively faith which issues in good works. One can only presume, therefore, that justification is possible by a dead faith. This is one of Marsh's difficulties—he does not know exactly what he means by faith. In addition to this, his doctrine of justification is confused, whilst that of sanctification, though often implicit, is never plainly stated and, from what is there, it would appear to be defective in its apprehension of the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit. It often appears as though Marsh is saying that of our own effort we do well and at the end of it we realize that the Spirit was helping us after all. All of it, however, comes eventually to this—that Marsh had practically no doctrine of grace worth mentioning. As some of his critics pointed out, his system was semi-Pelagian and it was difficult for grace to find a place within it. We may believe that Marsh was sincere when he told the House of Lords that his questions were "adapted to the present wants of (his) diocese; they operate as a check to some partially prevailing irregularities",[16] but there is no doubt also that he was imbued on this occasion, as he had been in his encounters with Simeon and Milner, with a sharp, polemical temper. The *Christian Observer* was not alone in finding the Questions pervaded by a "subtle, contentious, dogmatical, sectarian, and narrow-minded spirit".[17] It was right to conclude its extensive and competent examination

of the Questions with the declaration that the Church's policy must be "large, liberal and unsuspected".[18]

The whole controversy, brief though it was, epitomizes the conflict between those who accept the doctrine of salvation by grace and those who, misunderstanding or underestimating the rôle and importance of grace, would endeavour to substitute an element of salvation by works.

1 *Reply to the Strictures of the Rev. Isaac Milner*, 1813, p. 129.
2 *Hansard* (House of Lords) VII. 838.
3 Op. cit., p. 141.
4 Ibid., pp. 23-4.
5 See, e.g. *Christian Observer* (1821) XX. 169-70.
6 *Hansard* (House of Lords) VII. 831.
7 Op. cit., p. 23.
8 Letter of 17 August 1821, quoted *Hansard* (House of Lords) VII. 835.
9 *Hansard*, VII. 825.
10 Ibid., 830.
11 Op. cit., p. 75.
12 Ibid., p. 84.
13 V. 9; cf. *Reply to Milner*, pp. 111-4.
14 Op. cit., p. 117.
15 P. 120.
16 *Hansard* (House of Lords) V. 1172.
17 XX (1821), 177.
18 Ibid., p. 316.

WELSH CIRCULATING SCHOOLS

GLANMOR WILLIAMS

BY THE year 1764 a charity-school project in Wales, which had then been going for just on a generation, was sufficiently striking to attract inquiries from as remote and improbable a source as Catherine the Great's Russia. Somebody in her entourage had heard of the extraordinary successes achieved by the circulating schools of a Welsh country parson, Griffith Jones of Llanddowror in Carmarthenshire, and Russian emissaries were sent to the S.P.C.K. to discover more about the venture. Such curiosity was justified. Its object was perhaps the most remarkable experiment in mass religious education undertaken anywhere in Great Britain or its colonial possessions in the eighteenth century.

The author of the experiment was born in a farmstead called Pant-yr-Efel in the parish of Pen-boyr in the upland area where the borders of Carmarthenshire and Pembrokeshire meet, probably in the year 1683. He was the son of humble and obscure parents, and his father died within a few months of his son's birth. Having no father during the formative years of childhood may help to explain not a few of his reactions in later life. Little is known of his boyhood, but one of Jones's contemporaries, a man bitterly hostile to him, in 1752 published an account in sarcastic and partisan vein which may nevertheless preserve the memory of what was to Jones himself a valid and decisive experience. This was a vision of startling clarity of the "joys and happiness" of Heaven and "all the secrets of the Kingdom of Darkness". It left him, so his adversary tells us, with an overpowering conviction of being "a peculiar instrument for rescuing many souls", "wonderfully called to be a shepherd of men". Soon afterwards, he entered Carmarthen Grammar School in order to prepare himself for the priesthood, and after one or two unsuccessful applications he was ordained deacon by the saintly Bishop Bull of St David's in 1708 and was priested in 1709. In 1710 he became a curate at Laugharne in the vale of Taf in south Carmarthenshire, a pleasant region in which he was to spend the remainder of his days. In 1711 he became curate of Llandeilo Abercywyn, and in 1716 vicar of Llanddowror, a parish in which he remained until his death forty-five years later and with which his name is invariably associated.

While still but a young curate Jones must have struck others as a man of more than ordinary parts and piety. He was soon taken up by a wealthy and distinguished patron, Sir John Philipps of Picton Castle. A staunch Anglican of earnest piety whose self-avowed aim was to "live not a life of sense but of faith", Sir John was a leading member of the S.P.C.K. and the most enthusiastic founder and sustainer of its charity schools in Wales. It was he who gave the living of Llanddowror to Jones, and he followed this up in 1720 by giving him his sister Margaret's hand in marriage—a match which brought the bridegroom more in the way of connections than connubiality! It was Philipps, too, who sponsored Jones's own efforts on behalf of the S.P.C.K. He informed the society in October 1712 that Jones wished to go to Tranquebar on the Madras coast as a missionary. But, having learnt some Portuguese to fit himself for the task, Jones in the end was deterred not only by the "belief of his unmeetness and insufficiency" but also by the "extremely miserable blindness of his own country".

This "miserable blindness" he at first sought to dispel by preaching, for which he had prodigious gifts. Contemporaries regarded him as "one of the greatest masters of the Welsh tongue that ever Wales was bless'd with" and marvelled at his "superior burst of religious vehemence" that "like a flaming meteor did beat down all before him". But not quite all! There were neighbouring incumbents who were less impressed by his torrid eloquence than his tendency to preach in other men's parishes without their consent and to address congregations of as many as three to four thousand in the open air. He was summoned to explain his conduct before Bishop Otley in 1714 but defended himself with a spirited temerity which can best be explained by his being secure in the knowledge that Sir John Philipps was backing him up with the assertion that his defence was "clear and satisfying".

He continued, we may suppose, with his preaching and his parochial duties. But there is curiously little information of any significance about his activities in the 1720s. Nor indeed was it until about 1731, as far as can be ascertained, when he was in his late forties that he began the work with his schools on which his claim to remembrance rests. By this time he had become convinced of the marginal impact and the ephemeral effects of preaching amid a population that was largely illiterate and ungrounded in the rudiments of the Christian faith. He had learnt painfully "how

deplorably ignorant the poor people are who cannot read, even where constant preaching is not wanting, while catechising is omitted". "The melancholy discovery of the brutish, gross and general ignorance in things pertaining to salvation" had given him "great thoughts of heart and painful concern" and led him to "wish for, rather than any hopeful prospect of success to set up, Welsh charity schools". Oddly enough, although Jones had earlier had ample opportunity of observing the S.P.C.K.'s schools, he had evinced little or no interest in this aspect of the society's activities in Wales. It was only when its schools in Wales had dwindled to the point of extinction that he appears to have arrived at the conviction that they were supremely necessary.

In thus pinning his faith in charity schools he was, of course, following a well-trodden path. Professor Jordan's great works on philanthropy have recently accustomed us to thinking in terms of the Benevolent Revolution which took place in England during Elizabethan and early Stuart times. The ethic and pattern of charitable giving were clearly delineated during that period, and education occupied a large sector of this charitable economy. But Wales benefited comparatively little from it. The Commonwealth's Propagation Act for Wales of 1650 did more, but in the end proved to be an abortive experiment in state-aided schools. More attuned to the voluntary spirit and methods was Thomas Gouge's Welsh Trust of 1674-81. This was a charitable venture organized along the lines of a joint-stock company which can justly be looked upon as the typical eighteenth-century philanthropic society, Mark I. Its objects were to set up charity schools and to publish and distribute suitable devotional literature in Welsh. When the S.P.C.K. came to be founded in 1698-9 it regarded itself, as far as Wales was concerned, as a mere continuation of the Welsh Trust, although it was clearly much influenced by the work of Pietists of Halle as well. It founded 96 schools in Wales between 1699 and 1727, and distributed a large quantity of Welsh Bibles and other books. But even before the end of Anne's reign sectarian differences had taken much of the steam out of the society as far as schools were concerned, and by the 1720s they had nearly all collapsed. The truth was that all these efforts, commendable though they might have been in theory, had in practice only touched the fringes of the problem. No one concerned with them had properly understood the nature of Welsh society and its particular needs. With a wealth

of good intentions and a dearth of genuine insight, they had applied to rural Wales solutions which worked, when they worked at all, only in urban England. It took an ill-educated, hypochondriacal Welsh country parson to show what was really needed.

Not that Griffith Jones at first really grasped that he had got a different answer and the right one. He thought of himself as carrying on "part of the laudable, but more extensive, labours" of the S.P.C.K. Nor did he at first realize what an enormous responsibility he had assumed. though after the death of Sir John Philipps in 1737 he obviously seems to have felt that the latter's mantle had fallen on his shoulders. By this time, too, he had found a new patron in Madam Bridget Bevan, a lady of rank and substance, who may perhaps be flippantly described as a "poor man's countess of Huntingdon". She proved to be a staunch friend and close confidante with whom Jones was to work in harmony throughout his life. From 1737 onwards, however, the initiative was unmistakably Jones's in a way in which it had never been before. From now until his death in 1761 he was very much the managing director of the concern, on whom its destiny very largely depended.

Already by 1737, his schools, which had begun with a single school in Llanddowror, were in a flourishing state, and had evolved their own characteristics. The concepts governing them were uncomplicated enough. They were designed exclusively for a religious end: the salvation of the poor. They were not intended to make their pupils "gentlemen, but Christians and heirs of eternal life; . . . not to elate their minds, but to make them by the grace of God good men in this world and happy in the next". All that was needed for this purpose was "to instruct them in the catechism and principles of religion and to read the Holy Scriptures with all the speed that is possible". "Frequent catechising" was "certainly the best, speediest and surest method of instruction", while the "Word of Truth, contained in the sacred volume", was the "great and appointed instrument to raise the dead in sin into a life of righteousness". Since time and economy were of the essence, the teaching had to be done in Welsh because the population neither were nor could be qualified to "receive necessary instructions to secure their eternal salvation in any other language than their own British tongue". All that English-language schools had commonly

been able to do in Wales had been to get the children after two or three years "to learn very imperfectly to read some easy parts of the Bible, without knowing the Welsh of it, nor the meaning of what they said when they repeated their catechism". Hence it followed "that for the same money there could be but one taught to read English for twelve . . . now taught Welsh".

Teachers, though miserably paid at the rate of £3-4 per annum and placed under humiliatingly strict discipline, seem to have been recruited without much difficulty. They were carefully selected and screened so as to ensure that they were "not only tolerably well qualified to teach to read, but such as appear to have a more religious impression on their mind than is common". Before being let loose on their charges, they were brought together for training at Llanddowror, probably in a building which still stood until the early part of this century and was known as *Yr Hen Goleg* ("The Old College"). Here Jones thought it necessary to have "them together for some weeks . . . under catechetical instructions . . . to instruct them . . . in easy, familiar explanatory questions upon the Church Catechism, and so through all plain and necessary things in a body of divinity and to set them sometimes to catechise one another".

Working on as narrow a margin of financial backing for his schools as he had to do, "their subsistence being not much unlike that of the poor taught in them who . . . live from hand to mouth only", he had to cut his costs to the bone. No money could be spent on buildings, and his normal practice was to secure beforehand the consent and goodwill of a parson or some of his most influential parishioners, so that "in some places the favour is granted to have [the pupils] taught in the parish church or chapel; sometimes well-disposed persons lend a school-room gratis . . . ; and where we are obliged to hire a house, it is on moderate terms". Expenditure on books was kept to the barest minimum, thanks to the munificence of the S.P.C.K., from whom Jones requisitioned Bibles, catechisms, and works of piety by the thousand.

The schools were usually conducted "at such times or seasons of the year" as the poor "could best spare from the greatest stress of their several employments; which in almost all places" was "between September and May". Ordinarily, a school lasted for three or four months, and then the schoolmaster moved on to another district. Within six or seven weeks, Jones claimed, the

apter pupils had learnt to read Welsh. The phonetic spelling of the language no doubt greatly helped people quickly to acquire a reading knowledge of Welsh; but in some English-speaking districts of Pembrokeshire, also, where English-language schools were established they "prospered far beyond what could be hoped for at first. They were soon crowded with scholars, both young and adults, who made a great and speedy progress, not only in reading English, but likewise in knowledge of the Christian belief and doctrines." From the outset, adults were encouraged to attend no less than the children, and Jones claimed that in most schools the adults made up "about two-thirds of the number taught in them". Many more grown-up people, who had "continued long stupid and careless" were "impressed with some uneasiness" and thereupon began to "stir up and try to learn of some or other at home" as opportunity offered.

For more than a generation the schools were a resounding success. The story was not, inevitably, one of uninterrupted growth; the Circulating Schools, like most other voluntary concerns, had their ups and downs. For example, while there were in 1739-40 150 schools with 8,767 pupils, the number had by 1743 fallen to 74 schools and 4,253 scholars. But they showed remarkable resilience and capacity for survival; so that in 1756-7, despite the outbreak of war and "how hard it was with the poor, how dear and scarce all bodily provisions were", when Jones himself did "not expect they would be this year above half the usual number", there were in fact 220 schools with 9,037 scholars, "more numerous than at any time before". By 1761, the year of Jones's death, it was estimated that since 1737 there had been set up 3,495 schools in which 158,237 pupils, not counting adults, had been taught. Jones's statistics need modification. The true totals would seem to have been 3,325 schools held in just under 1,600 different places, with 153,835 scholars. These figures include all the children who were enrolled and take no account of irregular attenders, and although Jones estimated that there were two adults to every child attending this seems too generous a proportion. Even so, the most critical of recent estimates places the numbers taught to read within twenty-five years at 200,000, at a time when the population of Wales numbered probably between 400,000 and 500,000. This is, by any standards, an immense achievement. Given the difficulties confronting Griffith Jones, it is even more astounding.

In the first place, his whole venture was run on a shoe-string. It began "with no other fund to defray the expense of it than what could be spared from other occasions out of a small offertory by a poor country congregation". Thereafter, it depended on what its founder could raise by his talents as a collector. His pathetically optimistic plea in 1736 "whether parochial officers at the expense of the county stock could not help us" met with as blank a response as might have been expected. Fortunately, there were charitable organizations and individuals who responded readily to Jones's dedicated and unresting importunity. The S.P.C.K. provided him as lavishly as its resources would allow with books, not to mention a whole pharmacopeia of those bizarre drugs and medicaments in which the eighteenth century delighted. Landowners, piously-disposed and philanthropic, like Sir John Philipps, Madam Bevan, and Sir John Thorold, gave generously; the latter's open-handedness being particularly commendable since he had no connection with Wales other than through the schools. Three scientists, Stephen Hales, James Stonhouse, and David Hartley, less moved by religious enthusiasm than by the Royal Society's ambition to apply science to the rational solution of social problems, made regular and sustained donations. There were also a number of clergymen, especially in north Wales where it was difficult for Jones to exercise personal supervision, who formed a Corresponding Society to carry on the work. In the last resort, Jones depended more heavily on his fellow-clergy, although their financial contributions were necessarily very limited, than almost anyone else. Without their goodwill in allowing him to establish schools and use their buildings, in raising offertories, in catechizing and supervising, he would have found it impossible to do anything like as much as he did. To keep up interest among these supporters he published an annual report, entitled *The Welch Piety* (on the model, doubtless, of Francke's *Pietas Hallensis*), which consisted of a preface, a report by Jones, statistics, and testimonials from clergy and laymen to the work of the schools. But throughout, Jones had to work on the most meagre financial basis. He was never free from "great thoughts of heart" about "defraying the expense of so extensive an undertaking, with an unequal provision for it . . . for its best friends know that the supporters of it are but few comparatively".

Apart from having to be content with few active supporters, he had to contend with serious opposition to the whole idea of his schools. Criticism was concentrated mainly on two aspects of his work: his encouragement of the Welsh language, and the alleged connection between his schools and the rise of Methodism. To the former charge Jones replied that he was not concerned with what became of the language "abstractly considered", but with "the myriads of poor ignorant souls" who "must launch forth into the dreadful abyss of eternity and perish for want of knowledge". Even so, he advanced a number of arguments on behalf of the antiquity, dignity, and purity of the language which betrayed no inconsiderable affection for it on his part. The second charge of sympathy with Methodism was less easily disposed of. It found expression in a number of hostile pamphlets published between 1750 and 1752, the most virulent and damaging of which was the one by John Evans, rector of Eglwys Gymun, a neighbour of Jones. Its title explains its thesis: *Some Account of the Welsh Charity-Schools, and of the Rise and Progress of Methodism in Wales, Through the Means of Them, under the Sole Management and Direction of Griffith Jones* . . . (1752). It was undoubtedly true that Jones's views had affinities with those of the Methodists, that he was on terms of close friendship with their most prominent leaders in Wales, and that some of his teachers were Methodist exhorters. But he himself, in season and out, protested eloquently and sincerely his devotion to the Established Church and his abhorrence at the thought of subverting it. Most of his clerical confrères accepted his defence and *The Welch Piety* is full of handsome tributes by parish clergy to the beneficial results of his schools in the renewal of religious life in the parishes.

In what, precisely, lay the secret of his success? It has more than once been pointed out that there was no specifically novel feature to the schools themselves. They were far from being the first charity schools in Wales; literacy and catechizing had been given first priority in their predecessors; and the Welsh language had been used by S.P.C.K. schools—in north Wales at least. Even the idea of an itinerant schoolmaster had been mooted earlier: Sir Humphrey Mackworth had thrown out the suggestion in 1719, and "ambulatory" schools had been tried in the Scottish Highlands. All very true; but the essential consideration remains that *all* these features had never before been successfully combined and stripped

of all irrelevancies. What had previously been no more than hints or tentative experiments became the central characteristics of the Welsh Circulating Schools. Jones had grasped intuitively that the typical English charity schools, fixed permanently in a single centre, which earlier organizations had aimed at, could be no more than marginally useful in Wales. They would always be wrecked on three submerged reefs of which their navigators were either ignorant or took little account: the desperate poverty of pastoral Wales; its dispersed and thinly-scattered settlement pattern; and its language. Jones's feat was to devise a simple and economical design of short-term, peripatetic vernacular schools, which he could successfully steer past all three obstacles simultaneously. In doing so he was unconsciously following a lead given by the two previously most successful groups of diffusers of learning and culture among the Welsh—the bards and the friars; and he was anticipating the method of a later and equally successful institution, the National Eisteddfod. Like so many other successful solutions, Jones's seemed elementarily obvious—after the event!

He was blessed not only with insight but with rare talents for organizing. They enabled him to run his charity schools on a scale and for a length of time hitherto unprecedented in Wales. In a thinly-populated country of notoriously wretched communications, he undertook each year for more than a quarter of a century to establish scores of schools with thousands of pupils, make the preliminary arrangements for them with incumbents, train the teachers, and supervise their effectiveness. He was very largely responsible for raising funds and securing books. He himself wrote a number of the handbooks used, including a tremendously successful work on the catechism; and annually he compiled and published his *Welch Piety*. Such labours might have taxed the resources of the most robust constitution, but Jones enjoyed no more than indifferent health. His letters and writings are from an early date liberally besprinkled with references to his frail and ailing frame, and for thirty years or more before his death he was gloomily expectant that each year was the last of his life. From his youth onwards he was introverted and neurotic, and he showed repeated symptoms of psycho-somatic disorders. Yet however much they may have impaired his physical well-being, these same characteristics released in him extraordinary reserves of nervous energy as occasion demanded.

And occasion regularly demanded with Griffith Jones. For here was a man gripped by a compelling vision and an irrefragable sense of mission. Perhaps from that strange experience in his boyhood onwards, but certainly throughout his adult life, he laboured under a profoundly pessimistic awareness of a world lying under the threat of judgement. He yearned that his fellows "could be prevailed on to look over the reckoning of the last Judgment" with its "awful decision and tremendous sentence". Natural calamities affrighted him with the terror that "surely the hand of the Lord is lifted up and His wrath is abroad in the world, whether we see it or no". To him the England and Wales of his day was a profligate land sinking ever deeper into the mire of unregeneracy. The outbreak of the Seven Years War and the surrounding "fears and distresses and troubles" were the final dread portent that the vials of divine retribution might be about to be opened. Could so fearful a nemesis be averted without "humiliation and amendment"? He knew "no instance in history, sacred or profane, of a people irreclaimably profane, and grown fully ripe for judgment, who were spared without humbling themselves before God". All this was thoroughly in keeping with the strongly Puritan trend which had remained firmly embedded in the Church of England despite the Civil Wars, and was indeed intensified by Restoration laxities and later by the growth of deism and scepticism. Jones deplored, in characteristic Puritan fashion, those "sinful lusts of the flesh which, like an insatiable gulph, swallow up all" and cast a jaundiced and reproving eye on those "lewd plays, immodest romances and love intrigues, which poison the minds, captivate all the senses, and prejudice so many . . . against their duty to God".

But he shared also that profoundly practical concern, that strong sense of humanitarian obligation, that determination to make society fit for the elect to live in, which was die-stamped on the Calvinist ethic. Men would be known by their fruits, and of the fruits of faith none was more estimable than charity, "the sum of present and future bliss . . . the divine nature and the offspring of God". And of all the forms which charity took, there could not be conceived "a more divine, benevolent and godlike charity towards our poor fellow-creatures than that which tends to save their souls". In this lay the most prudent investment for temporal and eternal returns. "The almoners of this divine and spiritual charity" had "Scripture of Truth for their bond of security" and the holy

sacraments as its seals. They invested in the surest bulwark against social tumult and disaster, "the safest preservative against the calamities of this world, as well as the surest method of thriving in it".

But Jones was more than a timorous and unhopeful conservative. He was a visionary fired with a candescent utopian ambition: nothing less than the "utter reformation of a degenerate age". To him, morals could not be improved by penal laws or societies for the reformation of manners. Such remedies coped only with symptoms; religious conversion alone, he held, could remove the causes. Before his eyes there floated always a vision irresistible in its compulsion: "as the gospel, in the beginning of it, was first preached to the poor, and from them went forth and spread all over the earth; what if the Lord will think fit again to restore the gospel to its primitive force and lustre by the same method?" And what if he, Griffith Jones, "though at best but a very mean and unworthy poor instrument", were none the less the chosen vessel for so mighty a purpose?

A man with a mission can be as infuriating as he is inspiring, and Griffith Jones was both. His philanthropy had in it a pervasive tincture of the self-righteousness and holier-than-thou unctuousness of the professional do-gooder. The loss of his father at a tender age may have acted on him as it has so often done on others in like case. It bred an inner insecurity which craved for reassurance and itched for success and esteem. In the absence of an earthly father he longed to be a chosen son of his heavenly father and, for all his self-depreciation, convinced himself he was one. He could be opinionated, self-willed, domineering, and filled with his own importance, but he was liable to give way to irritability, querulousness, and self-pity. Extraordinarily thin-skinned and sensitive to criticism, he lashed out at his opponents with a vehemence that could be the very opposite of charity. Yet those same hidden springs which gave rise to his weakness were also the sources of his strength. It was they which urged him forward with relentless drive, unquenchable passion, and indefatigable perseverance. They ensured his success and they gave him his place as one of the two most remarkable men in an age of outstanding Welshmen.

Nor was his impact confined to his own lifetime. When he died on 8 April 1761, Madam Bevan was able to continue his methods with considerable success until her own death in 1779. By the end

of the eighteenth century the work was being carried forward by Thomas Charles, the architect of the Methodist denomination in Wales, who readily recognized Griffith Jones as his mentor. As established by Charles, Welsh Sunday Schools were for more than a century the most powerful medium of popular education in Wales, and, following Jones's pioneering lead, were intended as much for adults as children. To Jones more than any man the Welsh owed the massive break-through to literacy. It was this which sealed the success of the Methodist Revival and the triumph of Nonconformity, with all their immense attendant consequences for Welsh life. It did more than anything else to preserve and fortify the Welsh language and literature, of which the Bible was the corner-stone. If the Welsh of the last century and this have had an unusual respect for education and love of learning, credit for the origins of this is in large measure Griffith Jones's. He himself, limited in aims and circumscribed in vision, might be staggered and even appalled at what his handiwork has subsequently wrought. He none the less remains one of the prime makers of modern Wales and one of Britain's most notable educational pioneers.

WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

PAUL KNAPLUND

In 1917 a distinguished British man of letters warned his countrymen against a supercilious attitude toward the past. "The world's black catastrophe in your new age", wrote John, Viscount Morley, "is hardly a proved and shining victory over the principles and policies of the age before it."[1] But the generation which blundered into World War I and failed at peace-making gave no heed. Spearheaded by Lytton Strachey's *Eminent Victorians*, the cleverly-written, misleading, and superficial character sketches which stressed alleged faults of celebrated Victorians enjoyed widespread popularity. Writers with facile pens, little knowledge, and shallow judgement "debunked" leaders of the nineteenth century. Their earnestness and self-discipline were derided; their Christian faith and ideals were relegated to the scrap heap. Would-be healers of mental ills, who were themselves religious sceptics, counselled youth to shun inhibitions—the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount should be ignored, Christian ethical standards disregarded, and natural impulses given free rein. The hedonistic principle that the test of conduct should be what gives the individual the greatest pleasure was elevated to the status of absolute truth.

Among the Victorians who in the hapless 1920's were singled out for debunking was William Ewart Gladstone. Nor need this occasion surprise; it was he who most fully embodied those outstanding characteristics of Victorian England—deep Christian faith, devotion to duty, interest in individual liberty, and stern self-discipline. He had a long (1809-98) and extremely active life. For sixty-two years he sat in the House of Commons; nearly half that period he held ministerial posts; for a quarter of a century he led the Liberal Party. Four times British prime minister, he was well into his eighty-fifth year when he relinquished that high office. Described by a leading political opponent, Lord Salisbury, as possessing "the most brilliant intellect ever devoted to the service of the State since Parliamentary Government began", Gladstone showed keen interest in the dominant ideas of his crowded age. Extraordinarily energetic and versatile he wrote voluminously on many subjects—the classics, education, government, history,

philosophy, and religion. Upon his death *The Spectator*, a journal hostile to his politics, pronounced Gladstone "The greatest Englishman of his generation",[2] and Lord Salisbury paid Gladstone this final tribute: "What he sought were the attainments of great ideals, and . . . they could have issued from nothing but the . . . purest of moral aspirations . . . he will leave behind him the memory of a great Christian statesman." [3]

Born in Liverpool of Scottish parents, Gladstone to an unusual degree always bore the imprints of his ancestry and childhood home. His father, John Gladstone, a Lowland Scot, was one of the keenest and most successful businessmen of his generation. Although hard working, extremely methodical in practical affairs, and having large and wide-ranging business commitments, he was a devoted father, generous and kind to his family. " 'None but his children', William Ewart Gladstone used to say, 'can know what torrents of tenderness flowed from his heart.' "[4]

The mother, *née* Anne Robertson, remains more in the background. She was a Highlander, and from her the future statesman inherited his fiery Celtic temperament, imbibed a deep evangelical faith, and acquired the habit of daily devotions. Gladstone's most recent biographer, Sir Philip Magnus, writes that only by "Grinding work and prayer" could "his daemonic energy" be kept in check.[5] Gladstone has been called the greatest financier that ever had charge of the British treasury; his effectiveness as an administrator has been judged ten times that of an ordinary man; his oratorical successes both in and outside Parliament bordered on the phenomenal. Imperious as a leader of men, he always walked humbly before God. Throughout life he constantly appealed for divine guidance. This practice he had learned from his mother. His preparatory school, Eton, "was virtually pagan" in Gladstone's time, and the religious upsurge at Oxford came after he had graduated there. "Even the Confirmation ceremony", writes his biographer, "had been an empty show."[6]

The piety of young Gladstone was unaffected by the religious indifference of school and clergy. Wordsworth reports that when he was a guest at Gladstone's London bachelor apartment his host daily said prayers with his servant.[7] Courting the beautiful and high-born Catherine Glynne, Gladstone was happy to find that the object of his love shared his earnest religious faith. After their wedding ceremony the groom recorded, "We have read the lessons

together", and the following morning he added that they had jointly read the Bible.[8] Thus was the pattern set for fifty-eight years of happy marriage. Morning and evening prayers and regular attendance at church—where Gladstone fervently joined in the reading of lessons and the singing of hymns—became a rule of life from which he never deviated. Hawarden Castle, the spacious country residence of the Gladstone's in the foot-hills of Welsh mountains, was not only the happy home for a large family and the scene of numerous gay parties but it was also a Mecca to which world-famous men and women made pilgrimage. No matter who was there nor the number of guests, daily devotions were always held. Yet not all guests were expected to attend. John Morley and Lord Ripon were courteously ushered into the library by their host when the family gathered for devotions in the drawing room. Morley was an agnostic and Ripon a Roman Catholic so Gladstone deemed it inappropriate that they should be present at the morning prayers.

At Hawarden religiosity though all-prevailing was never oppressive. Life was gay and the children were given much freedom. Catherine Gladstone was extraordinarily charming and vivacious. She "twinkled". Family responsibilities, extensive charity work, arduous duties as her husband's helpmate, and sincere piety did not dampen her high spirits nor cloud her sunny disposition. When her husband's conversation became too serious she would break in with an irreverent *non sequitur*, and sometimes even declare, "William, if you weren't such a great man you would be a terrible bore." Unmethodical and unpunctual in most things, Mrs Gladstone kept inviolate two important precepts—she never divulged a state secret and she never kept William waiting. Their mutual love and trust had no limits.[9]

Gladstone was a devoted father. The children would ride on his foot "slung over his knee while he sang 'Ride a cock horse to Banbury Cross' ", or with four of them in two tiers on his back he would gallop through the house. Even in the presence of guests the children would occasionally contradict their father. But to them he was always the most important person in the world, and they regarded him "as some one who thoroughly understood us and gave himself to us".[10] The type of influence which the statesman exerted over his children is exemplified by the letter he wrote to his son, Henry, on the occasion of his confirmation. Important

Parliamentary business prevented the father from being present a the ceremony. His letter, quoted in part:[11]

> My dearest Harry,
>
> I am much concerned that my duties here should be so pressing as to prevent my going down to Eton to-morrow and joining my prayers to your dear mother's that the grace of God may abundantly descend upon you both in the holy ordinance of confirmation, and afterwards through all the day of your life. . . . I look most to what lies within your own heart. It is in the preparation of the heart that the surest promise as to this and every other ordinance is to be found; in the humility and self-interest, in the continued looking up to God, the silent prayer of the soul, for help and strength, in the manful resolution, resting on the hope of his aid, to follow right, conscience, honour, duty, truth, holiness, through all the changes and chances of this mortal life; and whether others will walk with us or whether they will not.
>
> May that preparation of the heart my dearest Harry be largely and richly yours, and both tomorrow under the bishop's hand, and afterwards at the altar of Christ, and in every turn and passage of your life, may the best blessings of God descend upon you, for time and for eternity.

One of Gladstone's four sons became a clergyman and two of his daughters married men in holy orders. The imprint of home and parents continued strong upon all the children. Twenty-five years after the death of W. E. Gladstone this writer had the privilege of being a guest at Hawarden Castle. His host was Henry Gladstone who delighted in reminiscing about the happy days of long ago.[12] His father's study, significantly called "the Temple of Peace" was kept as it had been when Gladstone lived. There stood his two desks —one for secular business and the other for his religious writing— and oddly enough, a bust of his great rival, Benjamin Disraeli.

Outside the family circle the religious precepts of the Gladstones found practical application in social work. Tenants on the estate were well taken care of; large donations were made to charity; and Catherine Gladstone not only looked after her seven sons and daughters and the twelve young children left motherless by the death of her sister,[13] she also launched and supervised several charity organizations and energetically solicited funds for their maintenance. One joint enterprise fraught with serious danger for a man in Gladstone's position was the rescue work they did among

London prostitutes. Although his wife supported him wholeheartedly in this work, enemies seized upon it as a means of destroying his reputation. One blackmailer was sentenced to prison for a year; it was Gladstone himself who by an appeal to the home secretary got the sentence cut in half.[14] A "debunker" of the 1920's who smeared the memory of Gladstone was dealt with through successful court action by the statesman's sons.[15]

John Gladstone's disapproval of the Church as a profession caused William Ewart to choose politics instead. But throughout life the Church, religion, and theology were foremost among his many interests. His first book (published in 1839), *The Church in its Relations with the State*, boldly affirmed that since the Anglican Church represented truth the government of England was in duty bound to support it and it alone. This extremely conservative view was later abandoned.[16] By 1854 he had reached the conclusion that "a Faith without State Alliance is better than State Alliance without a Faith".[17] On the basis of this opinion he promoted the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland and the British West Indies, and supported proposals for comparable changes in Wales and Scotland.

As Gladstone's intellectual horizon widened he not only favoured complete religious toleration and equality and a union of all Christians, but he contended that Christianity embraced more than the truth found in the Bible. A true lover of the Greek and Roman classics, he believed that they, as well as all of art, literature, politics, and science, if studied in the light of Christian revelation would greatly enhance the power of Christianity. However, he saw "danger from the precipitancy and intellectual tyranny of speculation", and he held that supporters of Darwin assigned unwarrantable results to his theory on which Gladstone himself had an open mind. On 10 May 1870, he wrote to Professor Stanley Jevons: "I must say that the doctrine of Evolution, if it be true, enhances in my judgement the proper idea of the greatness of God, for it makes every stage of creation a legible prophecy of all those which are to follow it."[18]

Religious bigotry Gladstone deplored. He was distressed when his sister, Helen, and some of his close personal friends abandoned the Anglican communion for that of Rome, but he strongly opposed the act forbidding Roman Catholic bishops from bearing English territorial titles, and he ultimately secured its repeal.[19] Gladstone

bitterly resented the action of King's College, Cambridge, in dismissing Professor F. D. Maurice for heresy, and termed it an "unwise, precipitate, and unjust proceeding", a proof of "a blinding power in theological rage, which often induces honest men to act like scoundrels".[20] Visiting Rome in the autumn of 1863 Gladstone had two audiences with Pope Pius IX to whom he explained that "the general tendency of these days is towards democratic government". His Holiness remained unconvinced, and confessed, "Mr Gladstone I like but don't understand." However, later when Gladstone attacked the doctrine of Papal infallibility the Pope denounced him as "a viper".[21]

In theology Gladstone was a high church puritan. The evangelical literalness in the interpretation of the Bible and a strong sense of a personal relationship with God which he had learned in childhood were combined with a genuine regard for historical Christianity and ancient church ceremonies. He enjoyed old hymns and stately ritual which seemed to him the outward expression of inward feelings. Catholic in many aspects of his religious views his faith rested on *The Impregnable Rock of the Holy Scripture*.[22] The knowledge of this fact, added to his advocacy of high moral standards in public life, made Gladstone the idol of Bible-reading English non-conformists. They trusted him: he was "the people's William" and "the Grand Old Man" of politics. *The Methodist Times*, founded in 1885, supported him, and the famous Baptist preacher, C. H. Spurgeon, revered Gladstone.[23]

Although always a loyal Anglican, Gladstone abolished religious tests for academic degrees at Oxford and Cambridge,[24] and he favoured allowing Jews and atheists to become members of the House of Commons. He took great pains to select only fit and worthy men for clerical appointments in the Church of England, and he helped rid that body of the prince bishop and the sporting parson.[25] His splendid library which was especially rich in books on philosophy, religion, and theology Gladstone presented to the nation. In the founding deed of St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, he wrote: "While the principles of the institution will be those of the historic Church of this country, and while the governing body will be appointed to work upon that idea, it is my earnest desire and full intention that the hospitality of the institution, and its conveniences and advantages should as far as possible be made

available for persons beyond the pale of the Anglican Church, or even of the Christian religion." [26]

This writer can testify from personal experience that St Deiniol's is being operated in accordance with the principles enunciated by its founder.

On many points Gladstone's career as a statesman exemplifies a development quite unlike that which most men experience as they advance from youth to old age. He entered Parliament as a "stern unbending" Tory; his valedictory sixty-one years later was a sharp attack upon the venerable House of Lords. As a young man he opposed forward-looking legislation; in middle age he rid himself of the fears which "had oppressed [his] youthful mind"; as an octogenarian he thanked God for having had the privilege of "opening windows". Having learned to love liberty he greatly aided its extension in Britain and the British Empire. Gladstone advocated reforms not just to change or to destroy but as means to right wrongs, increase human happiness, and preserve the essentials in government and institutions. For that purpose he dedicated his efforts in later years "to pacify Ireland". In urging a separate parliament for that distracted island he pleaded that such a grant would be in accordance with principles which Britain had preached to strife-torn European countries and had applied to her overseas colonies. Home Rule in Ireland would, he sincerely believed, promote a union of hearts of the British peoples. But his powerful arguments were ignored, and his far-sighted views were derided by a myopic generation. Old friends deserted him, Queen Victoria hated him, and he was reviled as a traitor to his country.[27]

Gladstone resigned the prime ministership in March 1894, because he disagreed with his colleagues on the issue of increased appropriations for the navy. Such action would, in his judgement, bring nearer "the controversies of blood which we all fear and seem to see are hanging over Europe".[28] Two decades later that dread calamity befell the world.

Gladstone's last years were chiefly devoted to the study of theology and the classics. At his final public appearance he made a stirring appeal to Christendom to save the Armenians from extinction. The appeal was unheeded. Infirmities set in; eyesight and hearing failed; but his mind remained clear and his faith was undimmed to the very end. Amid the suffering of cancer he declaimed fervently:

Praise to the Holiest in the height,
And in the depth be praise:
In all His words most wonderful,
Most sure in all His ways.

At dawn on Ascension Day, 1898, with the family kneeling at his bedside William Ewart Gladstone "crossed the bar".[29] His death was mourned by multitudes throughout the world. Five thousand messages of condolence reached his bereaved family. *The Economist*, a journal politically hostile to Gladstone, declared: "A darkness that can be felt has enveloped the land on the death . . . of its most illustrious citizen."[30] The leading British historian of our time, Sir George Trevelyan, writes of Gladstone: "He . . . taught Englishmen to think nobly, and foreigners to think nobly of England."[31]

1 John, Viscount Morley, *Recollections* (2 vols., New York, 1917), I, p. VIII.
2 Leading Article, *The Spectator*, 21 May 1898.
3 In the House of Lords, 20 May 1898, quoted John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, new ed. (Three vols, in two, New York, 1911), III, p. 529.
4 Quoted, Philip Magnus, *Gladstone A Biography* (London, 1954), p. 1.
5 Ibid., p. 50.
6 Ibid., p. 7.
7 Morley, *Gladstone*, I, p. 136. "He [Gladstone] believed in the efficacy of prayer, and sought through prayer for strength and for direction in the affairs of state." James Bryce, *Studies in Contemporary Biography* (New York, 1920), p. 475.
8 Magnus, *Gladstone*, p. 46.
9 Georgina Battiscombe, *Mrs. Gladstone the Portrait of a Marriage* (Boston, 1957), pp. 25, 40, 167; Magnus, *Gladstone*, pp. 47-9.
10 Magnus, *Gladstone*, pp. 127-8; Lucy Masterman, *Mary Gladstone* (New York, 1930), pp. 3-5; Ivor Thomas, *Gladstone of Hawarden a Memoir of Henry Neville Lord Gladstone of Hawarden* (London, 1936), pp. 14-16.
11 Thomas, *Gladstone of Hawarden*, pp. 28-9. See also letters to his children, William Ewart Gladstone, *Correspondence on Church and Religion*, selected by D. C. Lathbury (2 vols., New York, 1910), II, pp. 149-96.
12 Henry Neville Gladstone, 1852-1935.
13 Mary Glynne, Lady Lyttelton, 1813-57.
14 Magnus, *Gladstone*, pp. 104-9; Mary Drew (Mary Gladstone), *Mrs. Gladstone* (New York, 1920), pp. 246-8.
15 Herbert John Gladstone, *After Thirty Years* (London, 1928), pp. 435-6. Thomas, *Gladstone of Hawarden*, pp. 241-3. The offender was Captain Peter Wright in *Portraits and Criticisms* (London, 1925).
16 Magnus, *Gladstone*, pp. 36, 52, 68, 70, 97.
17 Letter to the Rev. E. Stokes, 17 Aug. 1854, Gladstone, *Correspondence on Church and Religion*, I., p. 127.

[18] Ibid., II, p. 101.
[19] Ibid., II. pp. 5-7.
[20] Ibid., I, p. 360.
[21] Magnus, *Gladstone*, pp. 184-5, pp. 235-6; Gladstone, *Correspondence*, II, 395-402.
[22] Morley, *Gladstone*, III, p. 421 and note 1.
[23] John F. Glaser, "English Nonconformity and the Decline of Liberalism", in *The American Historical Review*, LXIII, pp. 355-7, January, 1958; Charles Ray, *The Life of Charles Haddon Spurgeon* (London, 1903), p. 389.
[24] Morley, *Gladstone*, II, p. 314.
[25] Gladstone, *Correspondence*, II, p. 363; H. G. Wood, *Belief and Unbelief Since 1850* (Cambridge, 1955), p. 45; George W. E. Russell, *Collections and Recollections* (New York, 1899), p. 63.
[26] Gladstone, *Correspondence*, II, pp. 219-22, 451-3; George W. E. Russell, *William Ewart Gladstone* (London, 1913), pp. 272-3.
[27] Gladstone, *After Thirty Years*, pp. 317-55; J. L. Hammond, *Gladstone and the Irish Nation* (London, 1938), p. 145 and note.
[28] Gladstone to Lord Acton, 9 February 1894. Paul Knaplund, *Gladstone's Foreign Policy* (New York, 1935), p. 267.
[29] Russell, *Gladstone*, p. 281.
[30] Leading article, 21 May 1898; "When he [Gladstone] departed the light seemed to have died out of the sky", Bryce, *Modern Biographies*, p. 480.
[31] G. M. Trevelyan, *British History in the Nineteenth Century and After*, new ed. (New York, 1948), p. 409. Lord Grey of Fallodon who as Sir Edward Grey was Parliamentary undersecretary of state for foreign affairs in Gladstone's last government wrote in his reminiscences: "I have no doubt, taking force of character, energy, and intellectual power combined, that Gladstone was the greatest man in whose presence I have ever been", *Twenty-Five Years, 1892-1916* (2 vols., New York, 1925), I, p. XXVII.

CHURCH AND CITY

M. J. JACKSON

IN THE conduct of her mission the Church requires careful study of the situation in which she is placed. Industrial society concentrates vast populations into cities. This process of urbanization creates considerable problems for the Church, and this article, without being exhaustive, touches upon some of them, as they have been revealed by some recent sociological and demographic studies.

The fact of world-wide rapid and extensive urbanization since the industrial revolution is well known. Before it most of the world's population was rural and cities were small. "With the exception of Rome at the beginning of the Christian era and of Paris at the end of the Renaissance, the cities of the Western world rarely had more than 50,000 inhabitants before the nineteenth century."[1] From the beginning of the nineteenth century the balance changed. By 1851 England, the leader in this process, was already half urban. In the century since urbanization has spread throughout the world.

Since there is a positive relationship between industrialization and urbanization, and most of the world is rapidly becoming industrialized, it is likely that the world will level out a high level of urbanization. In 1800 before the Industrial Revolution in Europe the population in large cities was distributed over the earth in much the same fashion as the general population; after a period of world industrialization a similar position could be reached on a much higher level of urbanization than in 1800. The European and American pattern of urbanization, and proportion of urban population in total population, might therefore set the pattern for the rest of the world. Thus their present higher level of urbanization is a temporary and passing situation. A high world level of urbanization and the prospect of greatly increasing urbanization in those continents outside Europe and America would be for the Churches matters of great significance.

Europe had its pre-industrial cities, court cities, cathedral cities, university cities, fortress cities, market ports, and country towns, as do Asia and Africa to-day. But the characteristic city of our world is a production of the industrial revolution, although with variations and developments. The steam engine and factory system —concentration of capital and labour upon the resources of power

—development of regional specialization and therefore of specialized labour forces—were all factors in producing the Birminghams and Manchesters of the nineteenth century. One twentieth-century development is the metropolitan city—the great city with satellites —"a gigantic population agglomeration which combines centralisation with decentralisation, and specialisation and differentiation of function with integration and interdependence relationships".[2] The city is in constant evolution. War, natural disaster, economic and industrial changes, political changes, improved city government and planning, new architectural ideas and techniques, all contribute to the twentieth-century city to distinguish it from its nineteenth-century predecessor, although the one is built often on the other and both are intermingled. The typical industrial city is no longer Dicken's Coketown or like the gloomy portraits of Manchester painted first by Engels[3] and later by Taine in his *Notes on England*.[4]

Those who reflect on the function of the city in the twentieth century see possibilities in city life, which were denied either in the cities of the nineteenth century or in much rural life still. "Urbanisation can be made a source of pleasure and of dignity."[5]

The evolving cities of our time show both uniformity and diversity. The diversity among cities appears to be rather that of function than of history, climate, or geography. "In no civilisation is city life evolved independently of commerce and industry",[6] but the balance may be varied from a largely productive city to a largely commercial city, such as a great port. In addition a city, usually a metropolitan city, may be a political and administrative centre or be a university or ecclesiastical centre. Function also changes with size. An analysis of the functions of French cities has been made by J. Coppolani in *Le Réseau Urbain de la France*,[7] in which he traces urban function through various small towns to the medium size town of 30-50,000 *la ville maîtresse*, usually the administrative centre of French department, *the regional capital*, and *the national capital*. In a country like France the regional capitals stand upon a great tradition of history and are able to counterbalance the centralizing pressures of the capital city, by maintaining a healthy number of administrative, political, educational, and other professional institutions which are not entirely dependent upon Paris. The type, function, and size of the city are again important factors for the Churches and understanding of their task.

For the city dweller there is functional diversity. To quote the words of Houtart:

> Before the Industrial Revolution and even today in rural life a man's whole life was based on some geographical spot. It was in the village or the district of the small town not only that he had his home and his family, but that he worked, took his leisure and fulfilled his religious duties. The great mass of the population never stepped outside this *geographical dimension.*
>
> After the Industrial Revolution this dimension progressively collapses. In modern cities the places of residence, work, leisure, instruction are now separate and specialised. A new dimension is being drawn, no longer based on the geographical place but on function. We call it the *functional dimension* of human life. This plays a very important role in the life of modern man.[8]

The uniformity of the city is in structure, touched upon already, which means that with minor variations cities have similar structures. Following the classification of Burgess of the famous Chicago school, which developed urban studies with such insight and application, there is first the *business centre* based on the original city with a variety of institutions, administrative, financial, political, commercial, and cultural, upon which transport converges, active in the day-time, dead at night, with a very small resident population. In Chicago, for example, only 5,000 people live in the "Loop", but 900,000 go there every day.

Then comes the *transitional zone* between the business centre *and the residential districts. It has often slum, decayed housing* which has come down in the world. It is a "twilight" area, into which migrants often settle. While much of the population may be mobile there is also a stable working-class population which does not want to move.

Next come the more prosperous *working class districts and middle class districts,* housing estates of private or municipal construction, and then on their edge the *rich residential districts,* tailing off into the ex-urbanite areas of senior corporation executives whose urban style of life has a quasi-rural setting. *The heavy industrial zones* are separate from the other areas though sometimes near the transitional zones or working-class districts.

In this classification there is a certain uniformity of structure to be found in every city, varied by history of growth, type of predominant industry or geography. Where the variables are taken

into account the basic structure provides a useful means of breaking down what otherwise seems a vast, amorphous mass beyond human comprehension. This is to say that a city has a certain predictable physical structure and this structure imposes pattern of living and thinking upon those who live in particular areas. This is of importance to the Church's ministry. Also within the larger structure smaller units of neighbourhood can be defined in such terms as a block of flats, a part of housing estate, or streets around a shopping centre or school. These neighbourhood units which are basic to community living, should be embraced by the Churches in their territorial organization but often for historical or legal reasons are not.

Uniformity also lies in the problems common to the cities of the world. These are the problems of structure—"twilight" areas, traffic, etc., which are particularly pressing where the nineteenth-century city survives. "Urban renewal" is the technical phrase for the approach to these problems. In a special article for the annual conference of the Royal Institute of Architects *The Guardian*, 15 June 1960, said:

> Urban renewal faces a triple challenge;
> 1. How to adapt the old and often historic central areas to modern conditions and for populations much larger than they were originally planned for;
> 2. How to prevent the vast 'twilight' areas from further decay, by a combined operation of conservation, rehabilitation and redevelopment;
> 3. How to meet modern traffic requirements in the built-up areas, and particularly in the centres of our cities

In addition there are the pathological problems of overcrowding, slums, bank robbers, neurosis, loneliness, delinquent youth, spivery, prostitution. A common urban pathology unites the world's cities and marks them off from the countryside.

Urban pathology leads on to the whole climate of opinion of city life, of the ways of thinking induced by the city, of urban culture. The problem of defining the city has been a puzzle to sociologists, whether to define it in commercial terms, population size or density, for example, but the most fruitful solution has been for the sociologist, and also, it may be added for the Church's missionary thinking, along the lines of "Urbanism as a Way of

Life", the title of an influential article by Louis Wirth, a founder of the Chicago school of urban sociology.[9]

Urbanism is indeed more than a concentration of population within a certain area; it is a complex of human relationships in various conditions. The life of the city dweller is more socialized in the sense that he is more dependent on society. He has many superficial relationships, few deep personal ones. The rural rhythm of life is replaced by the demands of large-scale industry: shift-system, long journeys to work, etc. The city dweller lives in a form of society which is dynamic and changing. His expectations are this-worldly and secular. He is rationalist with his life depending more on his own choices than on traditional behaviour. Voluntary associations replace traditional routines. The "city mentality" described by Park and characterized by its sophistication, objectivity, utilitarianism, and rationalism, is, on the one hand, a product of the urban environment, and, on the other hand, a major force producing and influencing changes in our social heritage, in our economic and political institutions, and in the urban environment itself. As the German proverb puts it, *die Stadtluft macht frei* "It is not merely a coincidence that the great centres of learning, invention, innovation, art and culture have historically been in urban areas."[10] To an extent the city has changed human nature. David Riesman's other-directed type, the man who takes his values and standards by built-in mental radar from his group, owes his origin partly to urbanization. "The conditions I believe to be responsible for other-direction are affecting increasing numbers of people in the metropolitan centres of the advanced industrial countries."[11]

Certainly religion has been moulded by urbanism. In his study of the social factors influencing the American denominations Richard Niebuhr distinguishes those churches whose structure and organization suited the settled life of the Eastern cities and those more suited to the rural life of the frontier and how this separation emphasized theological differences and fed controversy. ". . . The religious conservatism and theological simplicity, the greater emotional interest, the individualism and continued sectarian organisation of the rural churches evidently distinguish them from the urban group. The urban and Eastern churches reflect, with variations among them, the more tolerant and more worldly attitudes of a European-born, aristocratic and city-nurtured ethic.

These urban churches, however, when they enter the field of social reformation show a larger interest than do the rural churches in the amelioration of industrial conditions."[12] The major theological conflict which Niebuhr notes on the American scene between city and country was over Modernism and Fundamentalism. "Modernism grew out of the social experience of the city bourgeoisie as well as out of the impact of the new science on religion." [13] Niebuhr's study is of one country with the peculiar circumstances of an extending Western rural frontier, but the fact that urbanism as a way of life favours certain religious ideas and organizations and discourages others is undeniable, while urbanism also causes changes and adaptations in religion. For example, studies of urbanism in West Africa show that Africans have adapted their traditional culture to the new conditions they find in the towns, among which is the Christian faith brought by European churches. "At the cultural level the adaptation made is syncretistic. Many Africans who join Christian churches continue their traditional belief in ancestral spirits, witches, etc., and remain polygynists." [14] It was also undeniable that urbanism as a way of life reveals certain moral and social needs and poses certain theological questions.

We should now turn to the position of the Churches in the cities. The picture will necessarily be impressionistic because there are not enough detailed statistical studies and studies in depth to give a full picture and because it is not possible to refer in a short space to all available studies. There are further difficulties in assessing the merits of particular studies and of comparison when the studies touch different continents and different Churches with their varying criteria of religious vitality. A discussion on the vitality of Churches in the city is hedged with reservations.

The first and deepest impression is the weakness of the Churches in the city from the time of rapid urban expansion beginning at the Industrial Revolution. A notable English study on the industrial city of Sheffield, E. R. Wickham's *Church and People in an Industrial City*,[15] concludes that since the industrial revolution the churches have never had as adult members the industrial working classes and that at the end of the nineteenth and in the first decades of the twentieth century the churches lost the bulk of their traditional members in the middling classes. In England as early as the 1830's acute observers like Thomas Arnold had noted the

absence of the urban working classes from the churches, which was confirmed statistically at the 1851 census of religious practice.[16] The census showed that about two-thirds of the population had not attended a place of worship on the day of the census and it was not difficult to identify these absentees as mainly the new urban, industrial working classes. The loss of the middling classes in England, hitting hardest the Nonconformist churches, came later, apparently as a result of an accumulation of causes in the nineteenth century, in particular, the climate of a scientific, secular opinion which clashed with the pietist other-worldly hopes of the Churches and hastened by the traumatic experience of the First World War.

The 1851 census produced much fascinating evidence in addition to the absence of the working classes. From it could be constructed a map in which the rural areas, particularly a wide belt stretching south-west from East Anglia through the midland rural counties to Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall, had much higher percentages of church-going than the London area and the home counties and the new industrial areas of the North Midlands, Yorkshire, and Lancashire, where rapid urbanization was taking place. Also a breakdown of religious practice in the towns and cities shows that with increase in size there is a falling off in percentage of religious practice.[17]

For a picture of religious practice in cities to-day the best source of information is to be found in Roman Catholic studies particularly in Europe, where in recent years a number of counts have been made, using special techniques, of urban attendance at mass. In all European countries rural religious practice is on the whole higher than urban, with exceptions made for certain parts of France and Germany. Some significant French figures are Paris (1954) 14% attendance by all those over the age of 7, Marseilles (1953) 13%, Grenoble 14%, Lyons (1954) 21%, St Etienne (1953) 28%. In Germany hardly any of the 22 cities of the German Federal Republic reaches the total percentage of the country. Cologne has 27% practice, Dusseldorf 29%. Italy and Spain show similar figures. South American cities compare with the French cities: Lima 18%, Rio de Janeiro 15%, and Buenos Aires 13%. There are a few exceptions: Essen (Germany) 40%, Bilbao (Spain) 50%, and New Orleans 42%. The conclusion of Houtart is that "with certain exceptions no important city of the West exceeds 30% religious

practice among Catholics". He points out that other Churches are in a similar position, as are other religions. "It seems that the sociological evolution of the present day world brings with it indifference to religion, localised principally in urban milieus."[18]

It is important to note that this is a new situation for Christianity. For much of its history it has been an urban religion. Max Weber wrote in *The Social Psychology of the World Religions*: "Christianity . . . began its course as a doctrine of itinerant artisan journeymen. During all periods of its mighty external and internal development it has been a quite specifically urban, and above all a civic religion. This was true during Antiquity, during the Middle Ages, and in Puritanism. The city of the Occident, unique among all other cities of the world—and citizenship, in the sense of which it has emerged only in the Occident—has been the major theatre for Christianity."[19] Weber's historical position receives endorsement in theology. The Bible starts in a garden and ends in a city. The earthly city, Jerusalem, is a type of the new Jerusalem where God reigns and his will is readily obeyed. The city is the place for the working out of God's purpose, for the defeat of idolatry and social injustices. The City of God is a theme for theologians and hymnwriters. In religious and secular terms the city represented a crown of human achievement. The fifteenth-century poet William Dunbar wrote *In Honour of the City of London*:

> London, thou art of townes A per se
> Soveraign of cities . . . . .
> . . . . . manly power, with craft is natural,
> Four none fairer sith the flode of Noy:
> London, thou art the flour of cities all.

In the eighteenth century Dr Johnson said: "I think the full tide of human existence is at Charing Cross."

The failure of the churches in the new urbanized world of the nineteenth century coincided with, and there may be here a combination of cause and effect, an intellectual loss of confidence in the city. A literary critic has written: "The concept of ideal order in human society, the world of man, which had provided Shakespeare and Pope with a frame of reference, had collapsed and could no longer supply images of harmony for the Romantic poets . . . so in Romantic and Victory poetry the city becomes an image or spiritual desolation, or even an image of hell."[20] Shelley wrote:

Hell is a city much like London,
A populous and smoky city.

Urbanism as a Way of Life is right in pointing out that more had happened than concentration of population. There was now a new culture which questioned the previous culture and the theological assumptions embedded in it. As a way of life urbanism revealed the inadequacy of those organizations, of which the churches were examples and which had failed to adapt their structures to the new culture.

The rapid urban expansion hit hardest those Churches with a territorial organization. Despite heroic attempts in some cases to create new dioceses and parishes, to erect new church buildings and to draft in more clergy the organization of the churches could not keep pace with the rapid population growth. An indication of this situation is to be found in the average size of parishes in certain large cities. In 1900 the average population of parishes in Paris was 36,000, Vienna 21,000, Budapest 27,990; in 1955 in Paris it was still 30,000, in Rome 12,000, and in Brussels 12,000. In South America Montevideo in 1909 had an average of 44,000 and in 1955 25,000, Buenos Aires in 1910 57,000 and 1955 26,700, and Sao Paulo in 1934 28,600 and in 1955 22,000. In more detail in France average figures in 1957 were: Toulouse 19,000, Strasburg 10,500, Nancy 9,5000, Lille 9,000, Grenoble 8,600, Nantes 8,300, Lyons 8,150, Marseilles 7,350. Similar figures could be found for urban parishes in England in the nineteenth century. An example of a Commonwealth problem for the Anglican communion is the city of Melbourne, the population of which has increased in twenty years from 1 m. to 1.7 m. There has been a 12% increase in parishes and 8% increase in clergy.

The chief victims of this process have been the working-class parishes. The figures quoted have been averages: almost always the working class parishes have been larger. Vienna in 1889 had 8 out of 19 parishes with over 40,000; these 8 were all working class. Paris in 1906 had working-class parishes of 75,000, 90,000, and 121,000 (Notre-Dame de Clignancourt). There are still about 10 parishes with over 60,000. In England, St Paul's Knightsbridge had 73,000 in 1840 and Leeds 150,000 in 1841.[20] Almost the only exceptions noted by Houtart were the small ethnic working-class parishes of Chicago.

Houtart also comments on the distribution of clergy. "The deployment of clergy among the population has not followed, at least in Europe, demographic movements. Thus in France to-day there are still 21,000 priests for 18 m. inhabitants of the countryside and 7,200 for the 24 m. in the cities." Of Brussels he remarks that "the city contains a third of the population of the diocese but not a fifth of the clergy are in Brussels. 40% of the diocesan clergy in Brussels work in schools and colleges."[22]

In 1957 Paris had one priest for 4,370 inhabitants, comparatively well staffed urban dioceses had less; Nantes had one for 2,150 and Lyons one for 2,950. The rural dioceses of Mende and Rodez had one for 316 and 523 respectively. The figures for Paris can be further broken down to show that the working-class parishes had one for 5,050, those in the residential areas one for 4,275 and those in the central arondissements one for 3,680.

The practical conclusion to be drawn from this state of affairs is that first the Church requires to study the situation carefully and then to adapt her structure, organization, and policy to the social realities of urban life so discovered. It is this very thing to which the energies of a number of distinguished sociologists of religion in the French Church are now devoted, led by Professor G. Le Bras and Canon F. Boulard, whose *Premiers Itinéraires en Sociologie Religieuse*[23] gives an account of some of the work in hand. The study of the situation requires study of a city in its various aspects, political, social, educational, industrial, etc., of which *Grenoble, Essai de Sociologie Religieuse*[24] is a model. It also requires analysis of religious practice. Some of the first results of the use of a census technique are discussed in Canon Boulard's book, while the *Centre Catholique de Sociologie Religieuse* has produced under his direction a handbook of instructions for the census at Sunday mass, *Comment Réaliser un Recensement d'Assistance à la Messe Dominicale*.[25] The study in depth has models in M. Quoist's *La Ville et L'Homme*[26] a study of a working-class district of Rouen. Another model study in depth is Fr Pin's *Pratique Religieuse et Classes Sociales*,[27] of the parish of St Pothin at Lyons. It is an analysis of the various factors which influence religious practice and of the attitudes of the inhabitants of the parish, practising and non-practising, towards religious practice.

The use of sociological techniques and categories to aid the Church in understanding herself and her situation is valuable. The

work in France has its parallels in England in the *Statistical Unit of the Central Board of Finance of the Church of England*, which in 1959 produced in *Facts and Figures of the Church of England* [28] a comprehensive picture of religious practice in the dioceses. In this it continued some of the census work of the nineteenth century. Apart from E. R. Wickham's *Church and People in an Industrial City* there has been little study in depth to match the French depth studies since Charles Booth's great study of the religious life of London at the turn of the century.[29]

Urban sociology has a considerable contribution to make to the Church's understanding of her missionary task. Urban demography, the fact of urban expansion, the structure of the city, the types of community within the city, the characteristics of urban culture, urban pathology—the items mentioned earlier—all are necessary studies. Any competent planning of the Church's missionary task is impossible without them; the geographical layout of diocese and parish will depend on it—the grouping of parishes according to type—the deployment of clergy—the use of specialist ministries towards the characteristic institutions of urban industrial society—the various points at which the Church should apply her energies and resources.

However, pause must be made at this point to raise a question of theological importance. Any mission of the Church, which is anxious to hear the word of God, cannot *tout court* study the urban situation and apply traditional methods, organization, ideas, and images. The churches have registered too great a defeat in the new urban culture of an increasingly widespread industrial society for a simple continuation of traditional methods to be permissible. The theological question is: What is God saying to the Churches through their defeat in urban society and through the new urban culture? One simple reaction is that urban industrial culture is a perversion of human society, that the Church is in conflict with it and has the function of setting up in opposition to it a counter-culture in which alone Christian life is possible. Much of the Church's strategy is based on this answer to the question. It is doubtful whether such a simple answer is satisfactory.

A fuller answer must appraise the scientific and social revolutions of the last 150 years and assess how far they give secular content to biblical categories like "Life", "the Kingdom of God", "creation". This is not the place to undertake a detailed analysis,

but some of the thinking of urban sociologists, of the philosophers of science and of social and industrial leaders of thought suggest that a very positive basic theological acceptance, although with a freedom to criticize and with reservations, can be justified of urban society and its institutions as opening new possibilities for human living in personal and social relationships. E. R. Wickham in *Church and People in an Industrial Society* [30] argues that the Church is in a weak position to-day in cities because of its failure to ask itself such questions in the nineteenth century when the new society was taking shape. It was a failure in prophecy, understood as a continual grappling with changing society in alternating acceptance and criticism.

The theological assessment of urban society will give direction to the sorts of sociological study undertaken, to the types of missionary structure the Church should adopt and to the content and form of the Christian faith. To travel quickly over the facts of life in the cities and its effects on the Churches is to arrive at some of the most absorbing and baffling theological questions of our day. Good sociology and good theology are inseparable in the Church's mission.

1 F. Houtart, *L'Eglise et la Pastorale des Grandes Villes*, Brussels, 1955.
2 *Urbanisation in Asia and the Far East*, ed. Phillip M. Hauser, U.N.E.S.C.O., Calcutta, 1957.
3 F. Engels, *The History of the British Working Class in 1844*, 1st ed, Germany, 1845.
4 "Manchester. . . . a Babel built of brick", H. Taine, op. cit., trs. and ed. E. Hyams, London, Thames and Hudson, 1957, p. 219.
5 W. Arthur Lewis in *Report of Duke of Edinburgh's Study Conference 1956*, vol. 2, p. 91.
6 H. Pirenne, *Medieval Cities*, Princeton, 1925 (Doubleday Anchor Book, p. 93).
7 Paris, 1959.
8 Houtart.
9 *American Journal of Sociology*, 1938.
10 R. E. Park, *Human Communities*, Chicago, 1952, pp. 108ff.
11 *The Lonely Crowd*, Yale 1950 (Doubleday Anchor Book, p. 35).
12 *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, New York, 1929 (Meridian Living Age Books, pp. 183-4).
13 Ibid., p. 184.
14 K. Little, *The Sociological Review*, July 1959, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 9.
15 London, 1937.
16 Cf. *Miscellaneous Works*, London, 1845, in particular, *Letters on the Condition of the Operative Classes* (1831-2) and *Principles of Church Reform* (1833).

17 Census of 1851: *Report on Religious Worship* (C. 1690). K. S. Inglis, "Patterns of Religious Worship in 1851", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. XI, No. 1, April 1960, pp. 74-86, examines the census results in the towns.

18 Houtart. His opinion repeats C. F. G. Masterman's in *The Condition of England* who wrote in 1909: "My own belief is that the so-called intellectual difficulties of belief are today less operative among the masses of mankind than certain other changes which are powerful in modern life. I should put in the forefront of these the creation of the towns, with their machinery and their confusion", p 275

19 *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, ed. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 3rd impression, 1957, p. 269.

20 R. A. Foakes, *The Romantic Assertion*, London, 1958, p. 44.

21 S. C. Carpenter, *Church and People 1789-1889*, London, 1933, p. 258.

22 Houtart.

23 Paris, 1955 (trs. by M. J. Jackson, *Introduction to Religious Sociology*, London, 1960).

24 Mme. J. Perrot, Centre d'Etudes des Complexes Sociaux, Grenoble, 1953.

25 Paris, 1960. Mgr Gros, *La Pratique Religieuse dans le Diocèse de Marseille*, Paris, 1954, gives an account of the first census of religious practice made in France, Marseilles, 1953.

26 Paris, 1952.

27 Paris, 1956.

28 Church Information Office, Westminster.

29 *Life and Labour of the People in London*, 3rd series, Religious Influences, 8 vols., Macmillan, 1902.

30 Pp. 190 ff.

REVIEWS

A DISCIPLINE FOR PREACHERS

THE LIVING WORD. By GUSTAV WINGREN. S.C.M. 25s.

THE THEOLOGY OF DIETRICH BONHOEFFER. By JOHN D. GODSEY. S.C.M. 25s.

IF THE preachers of Britain are not made to think it will not be the fault of the Student Christian Movement Press. Some religious publishers issue small volumes designed to make preaching easier. These two considerable studies in "The Preacher's Library" are aimed rather to lead preachers to examine what they are doing and to ask what is the function of preaching, in the context of a worshipping and witnessing Church, itself in the midst of a society which rejects Christ. A superficial reading of these volumes might lead to sermons difficult for the hearer to understand; but if they were really studied, sermons might in the end be simpler, presenting truth more directly, more vital, and at the same time more profound.

The Living Word is described as "A Theological Study of Preaching and the Church" and has a Preface by Canon Alan Richardson. It is well translated from the Swedish of Gustav Wingren, a Lutheran theologian influential in Scandinavia and in the thinking of the World Council of Churches. It places the reader in the lecture-room along with the students of Lund, and subjects him to a rigorous biblical discipline. A thesis stated on the first page is sustained throughout a closely argued book of more than two hundred pages. "*The Word* exists to be made known; only when it is preached is its objective content fully disclosed. Man was created in the beginning by the creative Word, and destined to live by that which comes from the mouth of God. Men understand themselves aright and receive true human life in the hearing of God's Word. The Word reaches the objective for which it was sent out only when it effects an entrance into men. Man reaches the spring out of which he can draw human life only when the Word of the Creator comes to him."

The history which the Bible describes continues when the end of the Bible has been reached. "Preaching means taking one's place in the midst of the mighty series of events that binds the beginning of creation in prehistory with the resurrection of the dead in eternity, to take God's Word, the source and spring of life, and speak it forth to men who cannot free themselves from the hold of the enemy." This high view of preaching results in a distinctive view of the ministry. "The ministry derives its authority from the message. It is wholly wrongheaded to derive the authority of the Word from the ministry. Allow that reversal and the Church becomes superior to the Word and Christ is locked up in the Church instead of being its Lord." There is no turning away from a close examination of the biblical record. He finds a certain Docetism, a shrinking from what is human, to be the main danger of present-day anti-liberal theology; and insists that "the Word

of the preacher is, in essence, a Word about something that has taken place . . . . Now and then historical criticism can with advantage be indulged in the pulpit. It gives more life to the kernel of the text than an accumulation of orthodox commonplaces. But when that is done, it must be in the service of the main message: he who feels it necessary to pass on to the congregation all his doubts about the historicity of the details has, it may be conjectured, an egocentric attitude to the work of preaching."

The name of Gustav Wingren may be new to most British preachers; that of Dietrich Bonhoeffer has become familiar through the publication of his works in English by the S.C.M. Press; and his heroic life and death has been recognized, in the words of Dr Reinhold Niebuhr, as belonging to the modern Acts of the Apostles. The detailed American work before us tells again the story of his life, from the youthful prodigy who, in 1927, at the age of twenty-one, astonished the Berlin faculty with a dissertation which Karl Barth named a theological miracle, to his death by hanging at Flossenbürg on 9 April 1945, only a few days before it was liberated by the advancing American Army. Throughout the intense life of struggle his thought was developing, and "the Church to-day is fortunate to be able to listen to Bonhoeffer and to profit from his experience, for rarely has it had such a theologically perceptive and articulate witness so intensely involved in a crisis of this magnitude".

To follow the development of Bonhoeffer's thought is seldom easy: and sometimes the reader wonders whether he can anywhere find a clue to its seeming contradictions. Dr Godsey is convinced that "the unifying element is his Christology and it is precisely the Christology that impelled his theological development". For Bonhoeffer the Church "is the place where Jesus Christ's reign over *the whole world* is evidenced and proclaimed, and it is therefore continually reaching out beyond itself and extending its boundaries". The Church is now called to an unparalleled task, for the Western world has repudiated its inheritance by turning its back on Christ, and the Church has now to prove that Christ is the living Lord of a hostile world.

Because these books place so high an estimate upon the Word and the Church they give the highest possible importance to the task of the preacher.

H. G. G. Herklots

THEOLOGY AND RELIGION

The Gospel according to St Matthew. By Floyd V. Filson. A. and C. Black. 28s.

The Path to Glory. Studies in the Gospel according to St Luke. By J. R. H. Moorman. S.P.C.K. and Seabury Press. 21s. and $4.75.

Too many theological books by specialists, for specialists, are being written, often in a specialized sort of jargon. Too many readable

Christian books are also being written which do not go deep enough. It is a pleasure to be able to welcome two books by scholars who know how to "get across" to general readers, and who have something important to say. Both books do what every theological work should do: they encourage the reader to ask for more and to search further. Both are free from conventional academic jargon.

Dr Filson sees the first gospel as the tradition of a Christian community in Syria, but a tradition which "Matthew" presented as the common message of the whole Church. It carries the stamp of an individual author who knew "that evangelistic appeal must be based on information and explanation", and whose main object was to teach (p. 21). Both authors are refreshingly free from the fear of losing face for being conservative; the gospels are a record of events which actually took place, sayings and parables which were actually heard: on the other hand, they do not insist on the evangelists' infallibility in details. Dr Filson is especially useful in pointing out what are the essentials which must be preserved, whatever attitude may be taken to the gospel as history: he will not discuss irrelevancies (pp. 51-62). If there be criticism of his commentary, it is perhaps that he ignores the typological approach which we associate with Hoskyns and Farrer (in their different ways); e.g. on pp. 172-82, in discussing the two feedings, there is not even the mention of possible numerical symbolism: neither *The Riddle of the New Testament*, nor Dr Farrer's books appear in the bibliography. There are also one or two things which might well be pursued further than Dr Filson takes them: e.g. ἐπιούσιος (p. 96). light and darkness (p. 100), the mystery of the kingdom (p. 159). But his book is well written, with some delightful prose rhythms (p. 95, on prayer) worthy of Bacon.

Dr Moorman's book has a heaven-sent naturalness of style, which could tempt a superficial reader to think it light. Almost every section has one or more little touches of original insight: the plough-boy looking over his shoulder (p. 119), the real definition of "neighbour" (p. 127), the "real temptation in life . . . to lose interest" (p. 134), the true purpose of the questions asked by Jesus' enemies (pp. 236-46). There is very little to criticize: is a sense of humour an overrated faculty (p. 75)? Anyhow, Dr Moorman's readers will not accuse him of any lack of it. A brief index and a map would help.

H. A. Blair

WORLD RELIGION

Christianity among the Religions. By E. L. Allen. Allen and Unwin. 18s.

Christianity has always been at the cross-roads; but the sense in which this has been so has varied from period to period. This book poses the intellectual dilemma facing the present-day Christian in a

more compact world, where the Church no longer has the doubtful advantage of hanging on to the coat-tails of certain dominant political and economic powers. Dr Allen is also well aware of the attraction of Eastern religion and philosophy for many in the West, an attraction which was prepared for by the European philosophical idealism of the last century.

The eirenical aspect of this book one must cordially endorse. East is no longer East and West no longer West, so that the twain cannot help meeting; and the more they share their spiritual treasures the better for the world at large. But one hopes that Christian theologians will have something positive to say about the theory of religion suggested by Dr Allen in his final chapter. Here he quotes from *The Coming World Citizenship* as his own *confessio fidei*: "The time is ripe for that radical reconception . . . whereby the concept of the Christ is extended to include that unbound Spirit who stands at the door of every man, and who, in various guises, still appears to him who opens, both as an impersonal word and as a personal presence." Need more be said to summarize Dr Allen's view of Christianity?

This book is attractively printed; but it is marred by poor proof-reading. Dr Allen could hardly assert (p. 20) that "there are no indications that Aquinas took the trouble to acquit himself with Islamic doctrines". "Acquaint" must be intended. And there is no indication where the pages referred to in the index by small roman figures have gone to.

D. W. Gundry

TWO TRANSLATIONS

The Gods of Prehistoric Man. By J. Maringer. Weidenfeld and Nicholson. 42s.

Socrates and the Animals. By Elena Quarelli. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

The terms primitive and prehistoric have suffered much from casual and careless usage. The prehistoric, by definition, belongs to the period prior to written or inscriptional records. To this definition Professor Maringer strictly adheres in his attempt to arrive at a general view of prehistoric religion as derived from the results of excavation. For this purpose he surveys the successive stone age cultures of Europe and describes the archaeological data furnished by each period, such as the skeletal remains of which the preservation of human skulls is a striking feature; the cave paintings and rock pictures; ritual artefacts and ceramic figures; the neolithic temple sanctuaries of Malta and Gozo and the megalithic structures of which Stonehenge is a familiar example. All this material is examined for the light it may throw on the religious beliefs and practices of prehistoric man. It is a field of

study in which imaginative speculation may easily and sometimes has run riot; but Professor Maringer is a disciplined scholar whose studious restraint inspires confidence. His interpretations follow cautiously, but not slavishly, in the steps of the late Father Wilhelm Schmidt. Like him he illustrates prehistoric practices by ethnological analogies drawn from the ritual beliefs of so-called modern primitive peoples such as those of the circumpolar regions. Such comparisons, if at times of questionable validity, are interesting and instructive and there are "remarkable parallels" between the modern primitives and the prehistoric. The discussion of the mural art in the cave sanctuaries of the Upper Paleolithic period, where man is introduced in a new light as artistic creator, is particularly rewarding. This art is not to be interpreted as exclusively magical. It was, also, a medium for the expression of genuine religious concepts

Incomplete as is our knowledge of the beliefs and practices of prehistoric man and capable, as it is, of variant interpretations, the evidence presented by Professor Maringer indicates the presence of religious aspirations from the earliest available finds. In prehistoric Europe we can clearly distinguish between two categories of religion, that of the hunter and that of the tiller of the soil. The former finds expression in sacrificial offerings made to a supreme Being as the divine dispenser of hunting fortune; the latter in a cult of the personified sky god.

Professor Maringer's book is to be welcomed not only for its own intrinsic merit, but as the first volume—though not the first to be published—in the Weidenfeld and Nicholson History of Religion. The production is admirable; many excellent photographs as well as line drawings provide a valuable aid to the study of the text. The original German edition, of which the present volume is a translation, carried the title *Prehistoric Religion* which, we may feel, indicates its contents better than *The Gods of Prehistoric Man*.

The second book under review, *Socrates and the Animals*, is translated from Italian. The author argues—daringly and not least for a Roman Catholic—that animals possess souls which are both incorporeal and immortal. The inquiry includes an investigation into the philosophical and theological implications of the question and evidence is drawn from modern research into animal psychology and from the author's own interesting observations of animal behaviour. Whilst the validity of both argument and conclusion will be seriously questioned, the book contains much of absorbing interest. It is happily free from the sentimentalism to which books of this nature are prone, and the author repudiates the all too common attribution of human thoughts and feelings to the animal world.

A. O. Standen

ECCLESIASTICAL COUNCILS

LE CONCILE ET LES CONCILES. Editions de Chevetogne and Editions du Cerf, Paris. N.p.

THIS volume has arisen from a recent conference at the Monastery of Chevetogne. It is one of many, encouraged by the possibilities of a Council to come, made recently by Pope John.

Ten highly trained Church historians survey, among them, the long history of the Councils, commencing with the "collegiality" of the early Fathers. A final chapter, of fifty pages, sums up the agreements and differences of the papers and discussions, in relation to the question of the unity of the Church, the Orthodox one way, and the Protestant Church of the West, the other. In dealing with the Councils of the first centuries, up to the seventh, a change of attitude is noted in the Anglican Church, following the numerous conversions to the Roman Church in the nineteenth century, and the work of Anglican writers, including Bishop Gore. It is in the "historical field" that many of the separating differences emerge, and especially with the parts of Protestantism which stress the exclusivity of the Revelation of the Bible and which rely on the subjectivity of the reader for the inspired understanding of the Bible, or which make the Bible the "sole" source of Revelations.

An Ecumenical Council is defined as one convened by the Pope for all residential bishops in communion with the Church; presided over by the Pope, whether personally or not, and when its Decrees are confirmed by the Pope. In turn, Roman Catholicism affirms the indefectibility of the Church, while fully conscious of the weaknesses and sins of its human instruments, as a visible institution, the people of God under the Gospel, and the definitive Alliance as issue of the Incarnation and of Pentecost. The writers urge the value of more organic, as distinct from intellectual, thinking—existential—in approaching difficulties and differences. In the relation of Church, Council, and Pope, for example, the conflict in the seventeenth century is used. In the end neither Monarchy nor Parliamentarianism were accepted. In dealing with questions like "Papal Infallibility", Church, Councils, and Pope are integrally indivisible.

The book is consciously a "preparer of the way" for the promised Council. It reminds us of a contemporary world fraught with great divisions, great social crises, revolutions of technique, humanism, Marxism, practical materialism, colonialism in torment; and the existing relation of Christian faith to these formidable realities. There is an undertow of hope that the Council may register a new unity worthy of a long historical succession, and of the contemporary need of mankind.

RENNIE SMITH

SPIRITUAL DISCIPLINE

THE WAY OF THE ASCETICS. By TITO COLLIANDER. Hodder and Stoughton. 9s. 6d.

A LITTLE book which with great simplicity and attractiveness speaks of big things. That self-discipline, "asceticism", is necessary for every Christian to some degree no one who has ever really tried to follow the call of Christ would deny. However the vast majority of honest members of Christ's Church to-day would have to admit to being too easygoing. The spiritual stagnation and flabbiness resulting from this disregard of our Saviour's clear statement "except a man deny himself and take up his cross daily he cannot be My disciple", are sadly obvious in the daily triumphs of many evils at this present time. Inspiration and practical help as to how not to disappoint our Lord in this key matter awaits us in this most cleverly arranged treatise. That it is based on the teaching of Eastern Orthodox masters makes the book all the more refreshing and instructive. The "down to earth" illustrations drive home the most sublime teaching, and the truths are made so clear that the almost frightening standard of spirituality is seen to be only reasonable.

One's great sorrow is the price. If only the cost could be in pence instead of shillings it would benefit far more souls than it can ever reach at its present figure.

T. L. MANSON, S.S.J.E.

SPIRITUAL TEACHING

A MODERN IMITATION OF CHRIST. By CLEMENS HUMILIS. Mowbrays. 17s. 6d.

THIS is a new and revised edition of two popular books of some thirty years ago, *Vox Domini* and *Vox Dilecti*. This present production gives us over four hundred and sixty pages of most practical and inspiring devotional reading. Some of the passages are addressed to priests, but, as with the *Imitatio* of St Thomas à Kempis any soul would find instruction and help from the whole book. The subjects cover a wide range and are clearly grouped. Counsels on the Spiritual Life, National Problems, Doctrine, the Evangelical life of the Soul, Divine Knowledge, and the Blessed Sacrament make the six "books", each divided into many chapters. These subdivisions are short and provide admirable foundations for daily meditations. The style throughout is clear and attractive while the points are made with vivid and telling illustrations. "The centre of life is self when pride maketh the circle. . . . Pride is a mirage in which self is magnified." "Pain offered to God is the raw material of glory." "Reason is the gift of God but faith is a higher gift, as different to reason as the flight of thought to the path of a flung stone." No one but would be the better for pondering the brief chapter

"Numbered Hours", for instance: "When faced with the imminent onslaught of physical death the Christian should . . . pray earnestly every hour of the day and endeavour to shed a light of love on all around him. Live radiantly for death is passage to more radiant life." Scattered throughout are trenchant sayings one would like never to forget: "Breathe and thou shalt live. Pray and thou shalt live for ever." "Woe to the people that divideth school from Altar."

T. L. MANSON, S.S.J.E.

A SURVEY OF THE BIBLE FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS

ISRAEL TO THE TIME OF SOLOMON. By A. W. HEATHCOTE. James Clarke. 6s.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND THE LETTERS OF ST PAUL. By E. RIDLEY LEWIS. James Clark. 6s.

THESE books form part of a six-book series providing for the needs of those who are candidates in the examination on Religious Education in the University of London General Certificate of Education. Three volumes are allotted to both Old and New Testaments and those under review are one from each section.

The Old Testament volume is the first in the series and the other, volume 5, deals with the Pauline section of the New Testament. The books are written in a style which children, of an age when the G.C.E. is normally taken, can easily follow and understand. At the same time, quite a high academic standard is maintained by both authors, for the results of modern scholarship and of research are used to the full in the compilation of an appreciation of biblical literature in the world to-day. Biblical criticism is wisely used in a constructive way and, where an even balance of opinion still holds the field, both points of view are frankly indicated.

The questions provided at the end of chapters should assist the student to make up his own mind on any given problem as well as helping him to clarify his view of the subject-matter generally.

Leaders of adult religious training groups, also, should find this series most useful.

FRANK A. F. POULDEN

DAILY DEVOTIONS

A DAILY BIBLE AND PRAYER BOOK (4 vols.). By E. G. PARRINDER. S.P.C.K. 6s. each.

THESE four volumes, compiled by the Reader in the Comparative Study of Religions at King's College, London, contain Bible readings and prayers for every day from January to December, with the

observance of major Saints' days. At the end of volume 4 there is a section for special seasons of the Christian year from Advent to Trinity Sunday, which do not always occur on the same date.

The well-chosen Bible selections are drawn chiefly from the Psalms, the Prophets, the Gospels and Epistles, three months being allotted to each group. Bible readings are followed by a verse from one of the hymns of Charles Wesley, a prayer, and a verse from the Psalms. The prayers are from ten main sources, The Book of Common Prayer, The Book of Common Order, *A Manual of Eastern Orthodox Prayers*, The Imitation of Christ, The Confessions of St Augustine, and the Prayers of Bishop Andrewes, Jeremy Taylor, John Wesley, and Christina Rossetti.

The books are well suited for both private and family prayers, and the massive use of a few main springs of devotion (as with the magnificent hymns of Charles Wesley) is much to be preferred to the "bits and pieces" type of anthology. Continuity is combined with sufficient variety, drawn from a wide range of eminent Christian liturgical and personal experience.

Bible passages are always given chapter and verse, and the Wesley hymns their numbers. It would be a further help if references were given for the prayers, for it is to be hoped that many who use these admirable books will be moved to seek for other treasure from the sources employed.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH.

COMMUNICATION

IMAGES OF GOD. By A. C. BRIDGE. Hodder and Stoughton. 16s.

LEVELS OF KNOWING AND EXISTENCE. By HARRY L. WEINBERG. Hodder and Stoughton. 21s.

EACH of these books is concerned with the basic problems of perception and communication. How does a man receive information—using this term in the widest sense? How does he communicate information to others? But although the writers share a common concern their approaches to these problems could hardly be more dissimilar. Mr Bridge comes to his task with a background of many years spent as a professional artist. Professor Weinberg, having begun as a research chemist, is now in the Speech Department of Temple University teaching General Semantics. Each writer is concerned with man's apprehension of reality. The conclusions to which they come about the nature of reality differ radically from one another.

At least to English readers Mr Bridge's approach and general theory are likely to make by far the greater appeal. He begins with a useful chapter on the nature of art and ends with a careful examination of the relationship between image and reality. In between he devotes three chapters to a brief history of Christian art, two to an outline

of Christian theology expressed in terms of the Image of God and the Image of Christ. The book is well planned, is based upon an obvious grasp both of art and theology, and is constantly suggestive and illuminating. When so much in recent years has been written upon the theology of the *Word* of God it is refreshing to be invited to think in terms of the Divine *Image* and to see how important this is for the whole life of the Church.

In brief Mr Bridge's thesis is that the twofold Christian claim that in Christ the image of the invisible God was revealed and that in the Church the symbolic image of the risen Christ may still be seen, may best be apprehended by appealing to the analogy of the fundamental artistic experience. There can be no place for coercion or dogmatic literalism in the relation between the observer and the symbol. Tradition and participation in a community are obviously important. But in the last resort man can only penetrate to the depth of the Christian Image as he himself participates in the Image through "the continuing miracle of life in the Holy Spirit".

Dr Weinberg acknowledges his great indebtedness to Korzybski and follows his approach to general semantics. He challenges his readers to think again about the distinctions between factual and inferential knowledge, between verbal statements about experience and the experience as it "really" is, between logical discourse and non-verbal communication. He emphasizes the place of the non-rational in life and considers the way in which the rational can affect and even control it. He makes his major distinction between the non-verbal level where man intuits his environment through sensations and feelings and the verbal level where he describes, infers, and theorizes. It is, Weinberg believes, because of a dangerous confusion between these two levels that many human ills arise.

From this kind of diagnosis he advances to constructive suggestions in what has come to be called "Semantitherapy". Underlying this therapeutic technique is the conviction that the greatest value in the universe is the survival of the human race and the chief instrument to ensure this survival is the symbol—using activity by which man spans time and promotes the healthy functioning of the total nervous system of the race. On the basis of these assumptions Weinberg develops a theory of value, examines the place of religion in life and concludes with a reference to the new science of cybernetics which supports, he believes, the general semantic thesis of his book.

I have found much that is thought-provoking in this book and the major distinction between experience and language about experience is one which every Christian witness or apologist needs to take seriously. For diagnosis and for preliminary semantic therapy a reader might well begin with Weinberg but if he wants to go beyond these to a vision of wholeness and to the good news of a Divine Healer who will renew the total life of mankind then he will find Bridge an inspiring and I believe a reliable guide.

F. W. Dillistone

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

INTRODUCTION TO RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY. By GEDDES MACGREGOR. Macmillan. 30s.

DR MACGREGOR set out to write a book on the philosophy of religion for students who have little or no philosophical training; he has succeeded admirably in his aim and, at the same time, produced a work which even those who do not, in this respect, sit in the seat of the unlearned may read with pleasure and profit. He writes with sustained vigour and everywhere we are conscious that he is expressing his own living thought and experience. The book covers a vast field—the nature of religion, the characteristics of religious philosophy, the meaning of "experience"; conceptions of the divine in the religions of mankind, the traditional "proofs" of the existence of God, the nature of man, agnosticism, human destiny, the value experience, the mystery of evil, religious language. Inevitably this programme involves a somewhat succinct treatment of some of the topics and this is most evident in the section which deals with the ideas of deity in other religions. There is enough, however, even here to awaken the curiosity of an attentive student and to make him conscious that there is much more to be known and to be said. It is impossible to review a book so wide in scope with any thoroughness; the most that can be attempted is to call attention to some points which seem to deserve special notice. The section on the ontological argument is a masterly exposition of the argument and of the objections to it—a real test of expository skill. I wish, however, that the author had spared a page or two to bring Leibnitz and Hegel into the story. An account of Hegel's use of the argument could have been illuminating, and introduced the student to Absolute Idealism. Dr MacGregor does not claim that the traditional "proofs" are logically compulsive; he regards them as "pointers". One would welcome a little more help in the question: In what sense are they pointers and do they all point in the same direction? The author's philosophy of Theism rests on an argument from religious and moral experience, the account of which forms the heart of the book. The chapter on religious language is brilliantly written and an excellent introduction to a hotly debated subject. The Epilogue, which draws largely on the author's personal experience, will probably seem to professional philosophers irrelevant, but to the general reader, and to the student, it will be a welcome reminder that the great questions debated in the preceding chapters are living issues in personal life.

W. R. MATTHEWS

CONTEMPLATION

THE MOUNT OF PURIFICATION. By EVELYN UNDERHILL. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

THIS short volume contains a hitherto unpublished work of Dr Evelyn Underhill entitled *The Mount of Purification*, together with a number of Meditations and Prayers (1949) and Collected Papers (1946). Many of these are already known and loved by her readers, but the first work will be a welcome addition to their libraries.

Based on the scheme of the *Purgatorio*, a retreat is made in which "the gradual cleansing of the soul from its natural selfishness and unreality by the fire and light of God's love, prepares it for a life of perfect love,"—the true purpose of its creation by God, and the ultimate goal of contemplation. "Contemplation" may denote contemplative life, contemplative prayer, or the contemplative spirit; of these, the third may be present in the souls of many who may not be called by God to the first, nor endowed by him with the second, but who still long for that union with God which is within the reach of the humble and persevering soul.

It is to this goal that the Mount of Purification leads, and the retreat shows how each deadly sin must be replaced by the opposite virtue, which can be woven into the eucharistic life.

A gentle but unerring finger points to the common sins of daily life, all of which have their roots in one or other of the deadly sins, though we are often quite unconcious of their true origin, and seldom take serious measures to conquer them. Yet until this is done, God's purpose for each soul is at least hindered, if not frustrated. But the power of the Spirit, and the unchanging creative action of God underlies and fulfils every courageous effort of the souls truly desiring him, and the retreat faithfully made, may at last bring the soul (in Dante's words) "regenerate . . . pure, and made apt for mounting to the stars".

Each retreat address abounds in the homely illustrations, the arresting phrases, and refreshing humour characteristic of Dr Underhill's writing, while through them runs her unshakeable faith in the great spiritual destiny of every soul which will respond courageously to the divine call. This retreat, together with the additional meditations, prayers, and collected papers, makes this small volume a veritable mine of spiritual riches.

A SISTER OF S.S.M.

WESLEY'S MEDICINE

PRIMITIVE PHYSIC. BY JOHN WESLEY. Epworth. 12s. 6d.

THIS book is a companion to *John Wesley among the Physicians* and is, like Gaul, divided into three parts. The first is an introduction by Dr Wesley Hill which makes interesting reading for those studying

eighteenth-century medicine or Wesley himself. Wesley had an absorbing interest in medicine and his belief that cures ought to be discovered by accident and then proved by experience is certainly not without interest to-day. His point is proved by the history of Electro-Convulsive Therapy and, being empirical, would have fascinated him. Moreover, he was a great believer in "electrification"—of human beings and not of railways—for many ailments, and among his receipts lists no less than forty-nine illnesses which he claims would benefit thereby.

The second part consists of Wesley's own preface in which he sets down "a few plain, easy rules, chiefly transcribed from Dr Cheyne". It is the third section which is disquieting, for it consists of a list of over 800 receipts which, although full of interest, would in many cases be highly dangerous if put to practical use to-day. The sub-title of his book is "An Easy and Natural Method of Curing Most Diseases" and when we have no less than fifteen receipts for cancer, for example, we begin to wonder if a little pruning might not have been of advantage. If these receipts are read in their right perspective, well and good; but "nature cures" are used by a surprising number of people to-day and when a proper diagnosis is made, it is often too late for treatment. This needs emphasis, for though this is not a book for the general reader it may, nevertheless, be read by those with little discrimination in medical matters.

NORMAN SMALL

SCIENTIFIC EVANGELISM

AN INTRODUCTION TO RELIGIOUS SOCIOLOGY. By F. BOULARD. Translation and Introduction to English edition by M. J. JACKSON. Darton, Longman and Todd. 21s.

ON THE title page this book is further described as an account of "Pioneer Work in France", and this sub-title should be emphasized for the sake of English readers who might hope for something more general in its scope. Actually the original French title *Premiers Itinéraires en Sociologie Religieuse* is more illuminating than the English version, and that its contents have a special interest for Roman Catholic readers in this country, but not for them only, is indicated by the Imprimatur of the Vicar General at Westminster and by the extremely small and inconspicuous type in which the Imprimatur is printed. That is, I think, entirely proper and reasonable, for though the book has as its explicit purpose the guidance of the Church authorities in vitalizing the work of the dioceses in France, its sociological basis, historical and geographical, is entirely scientific and capable of adaptation to the situation, Anglican, Presbyterian, or Free Church, in any country where records are available.

The survey is based on diocesan records of Easter communions, of vocations to the priesthood, and of missions from the seventeenth

century on. The results are worked out in detailed maps, which show very clearly the persistence across the years of local traditions of religious practice, far less affected, positively or negatively, by ecclesiastical effort than might have been anticipated. What does emerge is very clear guidance for the ecclesiastical authorities to-day.

Without interfering with the main course of the book, and with an almost complete suppression of his own opinions and loyalties, the translator, M. J. Jackson, has added a most valuable Introduction of his own, showing how these methods could be applied in this country. He has also added a Bibliography with suggestions for study. Although some small beginnings have been made, this Bibliography shows only too clearly the leanness of the land, as well as its potential wealth if the available material is brought together and properly analysed.

L. W. GRENSTED

THE PATTERN OF JUDAISM

JUDAISM—A PORTRAIT. By LEON ROTH. Faber. 25s.

ALTHOUGH Judaism has never claimed the allegiance of the millions, which Christianity and Islam, for example, have obtained, nor converted the races of several continents, its history partakes nevertheless of the infinite complexity which other religions and cultures created. Judaism never moves in a vacuum. Hence most contemporary books on Judaism try to set down the facts of religious development side by side with given historical backgrounds. Unfortunately, however, the very soundness of the method defeats its object, for the immensity of the subject would obviously demand a whole library and within two stiff covers an exposition of Judaism reads no better than an encyclopaedia. We are, therefore, deeply indebted to the author of this Portrait for his elegant and eminently readable account. He never loses history out of sight and he omits no technical term or historical personage of importance, but his purpose is not to give us another chronological framework but a portrait for the intelligent reader who is prepared to take the trouble to read and ponder every word.

Leon Roth is no Rembrandt who fills the canvas with Amsterdam Jews of the seventeenth century; indeed, he is not so much concerned with Jews as with Judaism—if such a thing exists. His book falls into five parts. A. The Pattern—where he reiterates the traditional picture: the people of God, chosen for holiness, taught by Moses. Here Roth stresses once again the concreteness of Judaism and its reticence. Jews are not to speculate about God, but to do his will. Life is not to be divided into religious and secular, nor religion into ceremonies and duties. The whole man must stand before God, not for mystic communion but to do righteousness. The Old Testament, Josephus, Mishnah,

Talmud, Maimonides, and the Prayer Book are witnesses as valid and forceful as the martyrs of the Book of Daniel. B. The Composition—where the author examines apparent paradoxes, such as oral and written law, Halachah and Aggadah, the Letter and the Spirit, rigorism and broadmindedness. The problems in this section are fascinating; they are typically Jewish and yet every Christian will recognize that in principle they arise also outside Judaism.

In the next section, C, the author highlights among Harmonies and Discords the issue of Dogma and Faith. Roth is of course devoted to Maimonides, the man and his work, but like many Christian theologians in their approach to Aquinas he mingles his admiration with critical awareness: "Maimonides and his followers had certainly 'tidied up' Judaism, but they had tidied it up too well" (p. 146). The revolt against this kind of scholasticism is a fact, but Roth dislikes the mystical movements among the disaffected (I was sorry he does not mention the great work of P. Levertoff in connection with the Zohar). Where mysticism stresses God's nearness and tenderness of feeling it has nothing new to add to Judaism and where it brings in new elements and draws on mythical elements it is no longer true of the tradition at all. In our need "the return to myth-making will not help" (p. 154).

In Section D (The Groundwork) Roth unfolds the tension between miracle and order: "we base ourselves not on miracle but on order. It is in the one order of nature that we glimpse the one God" (p. 165), though, of course, morality is the crown of the one order and through it we approach the point of religion: the love and the fear of God. Since Abraham is so central to our understanding we by-pass the merely metaphysical and see God as the Lord of history. The Outcome (Section E) is reflected in the Prayer Book and in the subtle and ever-changing relationship of Judaism and the Jews. They are rebellious, it is true, but they also believe and in their isolation suffer for their belief and exercise virtues of pity and the love of learning. Hence they have come to terms successfully with their neighbours and the "national creative power" adapts itself to the challenge of the moment. Judaism always solicits justice and the Jews act prophetically, like Jonah, and existentially, like Job, for themselves and mankind.

Obviously, this is not the conventional book on Jewish religion. The portrait is not painted to charm the beholder with superficial likenesses nor to move him with emotional sympathy. The painter is not an impressionist and even less an expressionist. Rather here is portraiture of an eminently reasonable kind; thesis follows thesis in the pursuit of wholeness. The inquirer will not be disappointed if he takes this very English guide to the maze. That Jews of an oriental cast of mind or the *sabra* of modern Israel or even a German liberal Jew (Baeck, for example) would lead him by very different paths only confirms Roth's own admission that there are many ways of portraying this ancient faith, these endless traditions, and the present reactions of and to Judaism.

U. E. Simon

EVANGELISM TO-DAY

CHALLENGE AND RESPONSE. By MAX WARREN. S.P.C.K. 5s.

THIS book comprises a set of six lectures delivered by Canon Max Warren, General Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, at the College of Preachers in Washington. The first two analyse with characteristic lucidity the spiritual, moral, and sociological situation in Asia and Africa, the second two deal trenchantly with the meaning of evangelism to-day, the fifth comments upon the Anglican Communion, and the last upon the place and work of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the U.S.A. within that Communion and the world at large. The importance of this book is out of all proportion to its size. It should be read by all who value analytical skill and penetrating insight wedded to a long and wide experience of the world mission of the Church. The style is such that the book is a pleasure to read and the content has a depth which will bring the reader back time and time again to many of its pages. Reference should be made in particular to the third and fourth lectures which face issues of vital importance to Christians the world over.

A. E. A. SULSTON

DANGERS OF CONFORMITY

SOCIAL CONTROL IN A FREE SOCIETY. By LOREN C. SIDELEY and OTHERS. Edited by R. E. SPILLER. Pennsylvania University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 36s.

THIS short book appears as the sixth in the series of the Benjamin Franklin Lectures. The term "Lectures", as applied to it, is perhaps a misnomer. It consists, in fact, of five essays by American scholars of distinction who approach, each from his own professional angle, the central subject of the series. That subject is defined in the fourth essay in the series as "the forces in contemporary American life that are leading us to conformity and in that way threatening the principle of freedom of the individual". The book deals therefore with a human problem, perhaps *the* problem of our time, that of how under the conditions of a mass culture and civilization to which we are inevitably exposed in this modern world the essential rights and values of individuality can still be preserved on a basis constituent of a healthy and balanced social order; and it approaches this problem specifically from the American standpoint and in terms of the forces prevalent in American life.

It is, perhaps, in the concluding essay, by a Professor of Law, that the relevance of the main subject of the series to American history and conditions is set in the clearest relief. It brings out the striking fact that a main tendency in American legislation, Federal and State, and in the Courts which interpret and apply it, has been throughout not only to

protect the individual citizen from any undue encroachment on the pursuit of his legitimate private interests, but positively to provide facilities for him to exercise control over his own life and destiny; a principle which found illustration, not least, in the policy of land tenure followed in the years of the great expansion westward; under which the land occupied was not assigned under lease from the State but as the personal property of the occupier. Whether, in fact, the claims of the individual have been given the right kind, as well as the right degree, of emphasis is another question.

P. A. MICKLEM

PAPAL PRIMACY

SAINT PETER AND THE POPES. By MICHAEL WINTER. Darton, Longman and Todd. 25s.

THE burden of Fr Winter's argument is that the Papacy, as it appeared in the pontificate of Leo I ("a pope in substantially the same sense as, for instance, Pius XII"—p. vi) was the result of a normal process of development of an institution from its germs, from the primacy granted to St Peter by Christ. His aim is confessedly apologetic rather than historical; and while his defence of the Roman primacy is both irenic and fair-minded, it scarcely adds to our understanding of the process that led to it. In particular, one might have expected some treatment of the manner in which the Papacy conceived and formulated its claims in terms of the pre-eminence accorded to St Peter (a treatment of the kind, for instance, recently given to Leo I's conception of the papal primacy by Dr Ullmann); instead of this we are given—once again—the New Testament evidence for Peter's primacy among the Apostles and patristic testimonies to it, followed—after an excellent chapter on the evidence of Peter's presence in Rome—by a survey of the claims to primacy and its actual exercise by the popes down to Leo the Great. In his concern to vindicate the Papacy against the charge of rising to pre-eminence on account of the civil importance of Rome, Fr Winter is rather too hasty in disposing of views according to which this is at least one factor to be taken into account in explaining the history of the see of Rome. This is but one example of his somewhat cavalier treatment of the importance of civil factors in ecclesiastical history; his explanation of "caesaropapism" in the East (this itself is surely a much-overworked historical simplification) as being due to the "lack of a practical ecclesiology" and "a disinclination to attend to the practical details of organization" (p. 184) in the Eastern Church is simple-minded in the extreme. The footnotes have more than their fair share of the misprints in which the book abounds; and the author's lack of consistency in citing references to sources is disconcerting and confusing.

R. A. MARKUS

DOGMATISM

INTRODUCTION TO DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. By EDWARD ARTHUR LITTON. New edition edited by PHILIP E. HUGHES. James Clarke. 27s. 6d.

WHEN Edward Arthur Litton wrote the Preface to the first edition of this work (it was published in two parts in 1882 and 1892) he left the reader in no doubt as to where, in his opinion, the Church of England stood. "The Anglican Church", he wrote, "if she is to be judged by the statements of the Articles, must be ranked amongst the Protestant Churches of Europe; and of the two families of foreign Confessions, under that of the Reformed rather than that of the Lutheran type. . . . The present work . . . makes no pretensions to frame, or to represent, a theology of the Church of England, as an insular production; a task very difficult in itself, and doubtful in its results. In respect of the leading points of controversy alluded to, its aim is simply, from a comparison of the public Confessions of the Reformed Churches, amongst which, as far as the Articles are concerned, our own is to be ranked, to expound the dogmatical system which goes by the general name of Protestant as distinguished from that of Rome." "Romanism", he tells us, "(including its mutilated counterpart, Anglo-Catholicism) is a religion of the incarnation, the virtue of which is communicated by sacraments; Protestantism is a religion of the atonement, the virtue of which is appropriated by direct faith in Christ, His word and his work, not, however, to the exclusion of sacraments in their proper place." And in accordance with this programme every section of the work is prefaced by a solid block of quotations from the Articles of the Church of England and the various Reformation confessional documents.

It is therefore perfectly plain what the author set out to do, and it may be said at once that, if this is what is needed, it could hardly have been done better than it is in this massive work of over six hundred tightly packed pages. In view, however, of the fact that Dr Hughes's editing is almost entirely limited to the occasional provision of footnotes making little if any reference to anything that theologians have written since 1892, the republication of the work after nearly seventy years gives it something of the status of a period piece, if not of a museum exhibit. And this is perhaps the more serious since the extremely moderate price of the volume suggests that it is intended to continue in use as a standard manual of Anglican theology. The contrast with the admirably skilful modernization which the Bishop of Oxford gave to the equally marmoreal treatise of Bicknell in 1955 is striking, and Bicknell's book was then only half the age that Litton's is now. When one thinks, for example, of the remarkable *rapprochement* that recent years have seen between Catholics and Protestants on the question of the Eucharistic sacrifice—de la Taille, Vonier, Masure, and Journet on the Catholic side; Benoit, D. H. Baillie, Leenhardt, Geddes MacGregor, Aulén, and Thurian on the Protestant—or of the readiness to reassess the sixteenth-century formulations which is shown

by such books as Père Bouyer's *Spirit and Forms of Protestantism* and Dr Jaroslav Pelikan's *Riddle of Roman Catholicism*, it is astonishing that Dr Hughes has added hardly a comment to Litton's work that might not have been made when it was first written. Such indifference to theology as a living science is sublime but hardly useful, and it is certainly unjust to Anglican Evangelicalism as a whole. It is none the less depressing to reflect that there are apparently Anglicans who are satisfied with a manual of Dogmatic Theology that has not been substantially revised for nearly three quarters of a century.

E. L. MASCALL

EUCHARISTIC EXPERIMENT

LITURGY COMING TO LIFE. By J. A. T. ROBINSON. Mowbrays 13s. 6d.

THIS book describes a radical experiment in eucharistic practice, based on modern insights into the eucharistic theology of the early patristic Church. The scene of the experiment is the chapel of Clare College at Cambridge where for nine years Dr Robinson, as Dean of the College, led a reformation in liturgical and devotional practice designed to give full expression to the character of the Church as the Body of Christ, showing forth his death and resurrection. The record is furnished with relevant documents in the shape of a series of sermons preached in the college chapel, and a devotional commentary upon the eucharistic rite.

Dr Robinson acknowledges an obvious debt to Dom Gregory Dix in presenting the eucharist as a thing which is done rather than said, and as the moment of the Church's realization of her unity in the Body of Christ. Although he contrived to achieve such a presentation with very little alteration to the Prayer Book service, he evidently considers that the 1661 rite needs radical revision, in order to replace an essentially medieval rite with one based rather upon the primitive and patristic approach to the sacrament.

This will be found a useful textbook for those who want a convenient statement of the modern fashion in eucharistic thought: although it is to be hoped that the Bishop of Woolwich will perceive that the parochial clergyman cannot put this thought into practice in his parish as easily as the Dean of Clare could do in his College. Dr Robinson's book will cause some of us to examine the medievalism of our present practice and consider whether it is quite as bad as he claims it is.

E. C. WHITAKER

TWO REPRINTS

PERSECUTION IN THE EARLY CHURCH. By HERBERT B. WORKMAN Epworth. 3s. 6d.

AN ANCIENT MARINER. By BERNARD MARTIN. Epworth. 3s. 6d.

ALTHOUGH now more than fifty years ago since it was first published, Dr H. B. Workman's *Persecution in the Early Church* has lost nothing of its original appeal. It still remains the best introductory account of the subject, and is deeply moving in its record of the sufferings of those persecuted for their faith. Students should be grateful that the book is now available in a new, cheap, and handy—even though truncated—edition. That certain features belonging to the earlier volume, such as footnotes and appendixes, have had to be omitted is understandable. A pity though that some sort of index could not have been retained.

Passing from early to eighteenth-century Christianity, one of the most attractive figures of the Evangelical Revival was John Newton. As the self-composed epitaph upon his monument in the London church where he was for twenty-eight years rector has it, he was "once an infidel and libertine, a servant of slaves in Africa". The story of all this and much more is fascinatingly told by Bernard Martin in a revised edition of his biography of Newton, now with the new title of *An Ancient Mariner*.

Both these books are recent additions to the "Wyvern" series of paper-backs.

GORDON HUELIN

TWO SOLUTIONS

INVITATION TO PILGRIMAGE. By JOHN BAILLIE. Penguin Books. 3s. 6d.

ONE CHRIST ONE CHURCH. By FRANCIS J. RIPLEY. Burns and Oates. 3s. 6d.

HERE are two paper-backs, each addressed to inquirers, but having little else in common. Dr Baillie envisages a rather highbrow public. His analysis of Christian belief and conduct is the fruit of a costly intellectual pilgrimage, which merits respectful study. It was however written in the early war years, and is thus rather specially "dated". Fr Ripley gives a superficial popular *apologia* for Romanism. To deny that the Gospels are true history is "about as fatuous as to deny that Julius Caesar ever landed in Britain." The author proceeds to assume that the Fourth Gospel and the ending of Mark record our Lord's *ipsissima verba*, that there is no critical problem about the Trinitarian formula in Matthew 28, etc. 2 Peter is the work of the Apostle, and in the apostolic Church there existed a hierarchy of bishops, priests, and deacons under one head, and seven sacraments ordained by Christ. Fr Ripley opines that the influence of the Modern Churchmen's Union has

for years been increasing and that comparatively few Anglican clergymen believe in the deity of Christ. The South Indian experiment is "pitiful", the pamphlet *Infallible Fallacies* "pernicious". In these eirenic days the book makes sad reading.

FREDERIC HOOD

THE MIDDLE AGES

NOTTINGHAM MEDIAEVAL STUDIES. Vol. IV. W. Heffer and Sons Ltd. 15s.

WINCHESTER CONSISTORY COURT DEPOSITIONS 1561-1602. By ARTHUR WILLIS. Obtainable from the author, Hambledon, Lyminge, Folkestone, Kent. 18s.

WHEN the first volume of *Nottingham Mediaeval Studies* appeared in 1957, the *C.Q.R.* welcomed the new venture and wished it success. It is therefore gratifying to discover from Vol. IV that the journal has not only established itself, but continues to maintain the high level of its contributions. Historians of the early Church will read with enlightened interest the article from the pen of Professor E. A. Thompson on *The Conversion of the Visigoths to Catholicism*, forming as it does a worthy companion-piece to that on *Christianity and the Northern Barbarians* which he wrote for Vol. I. Other articles include one by Miss Cora Ough on *Local Style in Church Architecture in the Stour Valley*, and an adaptation of a thesis by Dr R. I. Page in which, from a critical examination of the runes of the famous Bewcastle Cross, he assembles evidence for a slightly later date for the cross than that usually given by Anglo-Saxon scholars.

To the student of the social and ecclesiastical history of the England of Elizabeth I, *Winchester Consistory Court Depositions 1561-1620* by Mr Arthur Willis will be of considerably more value than the slender size of the book would suggest. It consists of a careful selection of extracts transcribed from records preserved in the diocesan muniment room at Winchester. The "causes" are listed under the headings of tithes, defamation, testamentary, matrimonial, disciplinary, and miscellaneous. They include such intriguing items as "wife-beating", "a novel way of chasing away a persistent suitor", and "a curate who was not all that he should be".

GORDON HUELIN

ARTISTIC EXPERIMENT

THE CHURCH AND THE ARTS. Edited by FRANK GLENDENNING. S.C.M. 6s.

THIS book is a collection of short essays, most of them dealing with the Church and some branch of the arts. The editor describes in the

final essay an experiment carried on in a parish church in Hull which was joined to the Anglican Chaplaincy in the University. The experiment took the form of an attempt to practise professional standards of artistic excellence and for this a number of local experts came together and pooled their thinking and their knowledge. Out of this corporate experience sprang this little book of essays.

All the essays are stimulating and full of enthusiasm. They would form excellent talking-points for small groups of other people interested in the subjects: they are provocative and they contain statements and opinions which could—and should—be challenged in discussion. But for this reason it may be that the book would hardly provide an adequate foundation of information about the great subject of its title, such as is suggested in the description of the series of which this volume is a part. Yet if there are many things to be questioned and argued over, the general position is admirable and the book to be welcomed for drawing attention to a fascinating experiment.

WALTER HUSSEY

BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN FATHERS. By F. L. CROSS. Duckworth. 15s.

THIS latest volume of "Studies in Theology" more than maintains the standard of the series. Here is a complete catalogue of Christian writings from the close of the New Testament to the beginning of the fourth century. Each writer receives a few words of introduction and is assigned his proper place in the development of doctrine. He is also given his own separate bibliography.

Naturally the scope of the book gives little opportunity for fine writing. What is more important is that it is concise, comprehensive, and of course accurate. Dr Cross has taken care to make it up to date. The discoveries at Qumran and Nag-hamadi receive their proper share of attention.

The book will be a god-send to every serious student, who will also rejoice to hear that two other volumes from the same pen dealing with the later literature of the Fathers are already planned.

W.W.

REDUNDANT CHURCHES

REPORT OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMISSION ON REDUNDANT CHURCHES. S.P.C.K. 6s.

THE Commission appointed under the Chairmanship of Lord Bridges in December 1958 has discharged a difficult task with skill and thoroughness. In their Report, which was formally received by the Church Assembly at the Summer Session 1960, and will be further debated at the Spring Session this year, they have outlined a new

procedure for dealing with a problem which has been a subject of increasing difficulty and controversy for half a century.

Fifty years ago there was only a small number of disused churches, mainly in country districts, which presented no particular problem as they were generally treated with respect, and left to fall peacefully into ruin. The changing pattern of population has increased this number to nearly 400—probably to be doubled in the next twenty years. Today, on the one hand, disused country churches cannot be effectively protected from hooligans, while on the other, diocesan authorities are constantly tempted to realize the site value of redundant town and city churches, despite the architectural value of some of them, in order to meet the clamant needs of the new housing areas.

The Bridges Report proposes first that diocesan pastoral committees should be required to consult the Central Council for the Care of Churches as to the respective and relative merits of every church in an area to be replanned. A draft scheme must then be submitted to the Church Commissioners who will consult with a new Advisory Board, to be appointed by the Archbishops after consultation with the Prime Minister. A waiting period of three years then ensues, during which—aided by a special Committee—the Commissioners must try to find a new use to which the building could be appropriated. If this fails, the Advisory Board will give its opinion whether or not the building can be demolished. If it is to be kept, it will vest in the Redundant Churches Fund, a body of Trustees to be established by Act of Parliament. The Fund will derive the income needed to put the buildings into repair and maintain them from contributions from the Church, the State, and the public.

Some churchpeople will object to the proposal of a levy on Church funds, but to repudiate responsibility would mean losing the right to reclaim buildings if they again become needed. It is relevant to remark that forty-three churches have come back into use in this century after long periods of redundancy.

One criticism must be made. It seems unnecessary to put all proposals into cold storage for three years. If at the first stage, the Central Council has advised the Church Commissioners that a church is of no architectural value, it might surely be demolished then, without delaying the whole programme of pastoral reorganization which hinges upon it.

O. H. Gibbs-Smith

THE CHRISTIAN SUNDAY

Sunday—Christian and Social Significance. By William Hodgkins. Independent Press. 21s.

The setting apart of one day of the week for worship, recreation, and rest would appear to meet a fundamental need of the human race. In spite of attempts to abolish Sunday in France and Russia at the time

of their revolutions, it still persists and has spread to many countries of Asia and Africa.

Mr Hodgkins has given us in this book a historical account of the English Sunday from early times, together with a biblical introduction of the meaning of the Sabbath and of the origins of the Christian Sunday in the New Testament. He goes on to discuss the best way in which Sunday can be used in these days and outlines a positive approach which the Churches might with confidence put before the nation.

Christians will, of course, place first the duty of corporate worship and they have a right to ask that no Christian should be prevented from attending church by the nature of his work. Only the most essential work should be required on Sunday mornings and quiet should be strictly enforced near places of worship. Mr Hodgkins thinks that the rest of the day should be used for educational purposes and for family entertainment and recreation. He points out, quite rightly, that the advent of television and the raising of the standard of education have widened considerably the use to which time on Sunday can be put. We now have the opportunity for fresh thinking and new experiments on the whole question of Sunday observance. This book should meet a real need in helping us to think out this new approach.

JOHN DREWETT

MEDICAL MISSIONS

JUNGLE DOCTOR PANORAMA. By PAUL WHITE. Paternoster Press 35s.

Jungle Doctor Panorama is a photographic production with an amazing appeal which brings the problems of Africa and its medical needs, as seen through the eyes of workers in bush hospitals, right home to those in this country who might prefer to leave the African to his own devices. This panorama throws a fresh light on the problems and self-sacrifice of those missionaries who struggle in these isolated hospitals against overwhelming odds; lack of money and lack of staff. Very lavishly illustrated, it presents a challenge which must stir the conscience of every thinking man and woman.

To read that African lives can be saved at the cost of one pound, or two dollars each—that a twenty bed ward there is run for the cost of only one bed in a hospital at home—is to show up the problem in sharp relief. This is a book with a subject for intercession on every page, and in almost every picture. With their motto, "The Love of Christ constrains us", the jungle doctors and nurses labour in vast territories where the witch doctor still holds sway, bringing the light of the world to human minds in chains and darkness.

A stupendous production, with an overwhelming sense of urgency in its appeal, and with a message on which we must act—and act quickly.

A. WHITE-COOPER

SCOTTISH CHRISTIANITY (1)

KIRK AND NATION. By J. M. REID. Skeffington. 21s.

MR REID is to be congratulated on producing an excellent Church History of Scotland which is probably better suited to the average reader than the longer work of Dr Burleigh, although its theology is not so satisfactory. The book is given the highest setting when its author writes in his first chapter: "The Church exists, after all, not for any political purpose, not for education of a general sort, not for arts or material comfort, but for God, and for men in their relations to God. Its task is to worship and to teach the revelation of God through Jesus Christ." After this magnificent statement, which forms the background of the whole book, it is disappointing to meet such a misleading description of the faith of the medieval Church as is contained in the first paragraph of page 15. Again it is surely unfair to state on page 102: "No doubt the witch cult was a survival of paganism which grew stronger when the Church ceased to foster ceremonies and beliefs that were partly pagan." It is curious to find a Presbyterian writer using the expression "Roman Catholic" for the pre-Reformation Church as well as for the Western Church owing obedience to the doctrines of the Council of Trent.

But these criticisms are of small blemishes in a book remarkable for deep insight and adorned by many felicitous passages, of which it must suffice to quote two. "The restored Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland . . . recognized in practice that God could not be tied to a treaty." And of the introduction of "individual cups", "In the name of temperance these were often filled not with the wine of the Last Supper, but with an unquestionably hygienic fruit juice—one of the less happy symbols of genteel progress and refinement." We are also most grateful to Mr Reid for making known to us the exquisite "ballate" quoted on page 34. The appendixes are of real value and Episcopalians may like to take note on page 193 of a passage in the Second Book of Discipline 1578: "As to bischops, if the name episcopos be properly takin, they ar all ane with the ministers, as befoir was declarit. For it is not a name of superioritie and lordschip, bot of office and watching." It is an interesting speculation whether, if the counsels of the saintly Robert Leighton had prevailed over Charles I, episcopacy might have been restored to the Church of Scotland in a form which could have won almost universal acceptance.

All Scottish churchmen, whether Presbyterian or Episcopalian, will surely echo Mr Reid's fine concluding paragraph and thank him for giving them such a clear panorama of their country's history.

PHYLLIS GRAHAM

SCOTTISH CHRISTIANITY (II)

THE SCOTTISH CHURCHES. By JOHN HIGHET. Skeffington. 30s.

THE labour involved in the preparation of this book must have been immense but the wealth of statistics given might act as a deterrent to the general reader. Chapters I and II suffer most, while the mass of quoted opinions in chapter IV is also somewhat tedious. Chapter VI, "What keeps the Unchurched Away", may prove of greater interest to the average reader, while chapter VII gives a fair picture of present-day "official" views on most important social topics. The concluding "Assessment" is too vague to be very helpful.

One misses in this book any appreciation of the Churches' main duty as seen for example in J. M. Reid's contemporary publication *Kirk and Nation*—the work of worship. (The Iona Community it may be noted gives prayer the priority in its rules.) Perhaps the work of collecting statistics is soul-destroying, but one must admire the fairness shown to the smallest denominations. It may come as a surprise to many to learn that there are half a million Roman Catholics in Scotland (the figure for the Established Church being 1,315,000), but an estimate of the contribution of this vast body of churchmen is hardly attempted. Anglican readers will turn with interest to what Dr Highet has to say about the "Bishops Report" and its repercussions in the national Press. It should be pointed out that the popular Scottish Press played up the worst type of nationalism. May it not be a sign of grace that the eminent divine who so brilliantly defended the Report in the General Assembly of 1957 and resigned his convenorship when it was defeated now occupies the Moderator's chair?

In his remarks about the place of women in the Churches the author makes no reference to the large representation given them in the councils of the Scottish Episcopal Church which in this regard is far more democratic than the Establishment.

In conclusion, any honest inquirer into the state of the "Churches" in Scotland four-hundred years after the Reformation will find in this book a wealth of information presented with meticulous care in a completely unbiased form.

PHYLLIS GRAHAM

LITURGICAL EXPOSITIONS

A COMMENTARY ON THE DIVINE LITURGY (NICHOLAS CABASILAS). Translated by J. M. HUSSEY and P. A. MCNULTY. S.P.C.K. 18s. 6d.

ADVENT: ITS LITURGAL SIGNIFICANCE. By PATRICK COWLEY. Faith Press. 7s. 6d.

AT FIRST glance these two books seem to be unequally yoked together. The former is a translation that might be expected to be only of

historical interest, while the latter proclaims itself (with its grey-and-purple paper cover) merely as a seasonal tract. In fact, however, the translation of Cabasilas is such that few communicants could read it without devotional advantage, while *Advent* turns out to be a work of scholarship.

Cabasilas wrote his commentary some time during the fourteenth century, when the Liturgy of St Chrysostom had become the normal rite of the Orthodox East and had attained substantially its present form. Professor Hussey and Miss McNulty have been extremely successful in their attempt to bring his work into lively contact with the modern English reader. The translation can be read with as much pleasure as if Cabasilas had written in English; their introduction describes the celebration of the Liturgy, with copious quotations; and the footnotes explain points that might perplex the reader as he goes along. One of these notes, nevertheless, probably "corrects" Cabasilas unnecessarily (p. 74): it is true that only the hands of a priest are anointed in the Roman ordination rite, but the head was anointed as well in pre-Conquest England and elsewhere, so that Cabasilas may well be quoting accurately the western rite known to him. For the student of liturgy the treatise is, of course, full of detailed interest. For the ordinary western Christian it will be of assistance in understanding the mind of Eastern Christendom: and, in spite of occasional polemics, a Christian of any tradition should find it an aid to active and intelligent participation in the Eucharist.

If Cabasilas can be a help to any Christian, then Prebendary Cowley can be of assistance to any parish priest. He attempts the very important task of recalling Christian people to the true celebration of Advent. He writes clearly and with penetration, as well as with a good deal of learning. He is neither a scholar remote from parish life nor a parish priest promoting some new liturgical craze; and he is equally at home with books and with souls. He has written a valuable book expounding the history and theology of Advent. If he has not provided a fully paved and posted road through the documents, this is not to be wondered at; for they are complex. But he appears to contradict himself in the matter of the connection between Advent and Christmas. Some assistance in resolving this contradiction could be (but is not) derived from his Note 9. But the contradiction really springs from two mistakes: the use of Roman and Romano-Gallican documents as though they were evidence for the same church, and the failure to take account of the titles as well as the prayers in the sacramentaries. But this should not diminish our gratitude for taking us so far. If every priest would use this book as a quarry of material for his Advent sermons over five years, then the Church would have gone a long way towards the recovery and reinstatement of Advent.

BERNARD WIGAN

PREACHING AND PRACTICE

AN EXPOSITORY PREACHER'S NOTEBOOK. By D. W. CLEVERLEY FORD. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

WE ARE HAPPY. A Collection of Letters. Edited by RALPH RICKETTS. Darton, Longman and Todd. 12s. 6d.

THE welcome and necessary College of Preachers began its work in November 1960. It was appropriate that this excellent book should be written by its director, for if the high standard is maintained we should have great hopes for the future of preaching in the Church of England.

The author contributes a striking preface on the content and technique of expository preaching, and then goes on to give forty examples. Part I consists of ten sermons on "God's Royalty", expounding St Matthew's Gospel: Part II, three Old Testament character studies and four sermons on the "Servant Songs" of Isaiah: Part III is a collection of thirteen individual sermons.

A versatile mind provides a wide range of interest, and a craftsman's virtuosity delights again and again. It is no mean feat to be able to preach sermons like "A Royal Pedigree", "Solomon the Pompous", and "When Preaching is Effective".

We should be indeed thankful to find here one who not only believes in the vital importance of good preaching, but whose sermons are preached, with rather than at, his people. "A congregation", he says, "creates the preacher it deserves", and "the ministry does depend on the minister. But it also depends on the congregation. And when the two are faithful God's presence there is felt." This is a "must" book for clergy, ordinands, and lay readers.

The editor of *We are Happy* tells us in his preface that, following discussion with a friend on the nature and possibility of happiness, he inserted an advertisement in the personal columns of two newspapers:

> HAPPINESS—Advertiser becoming sceptical of its possibility would like to hear from those who consider they are happy, in hope of isolating essential ingredient in the various recipes.

Nearly three hundred people replied, and this book contains a selection of eighty-three excerpts from the letters. The writers' ages vary from twenty-two to ninety-two, and it appears that no age group has superiority in happiness over the rest. It is remarkable how the keynotes of going out of self in faith and love and the willed acceptance of life and all it brings recur again and again.

There is great hope in this book, for it shows unhappiness and false happiness being overcome and discarded, and reveals how in and through suffering happiness can still be possessed.

Appropriately, a percentage of the books profits will go to the Ryder-Cheshire Mission for the Relief of Suffering.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

PASTORAL CARE

ESSAYS IN PASTORAL RECONSTRUCTION. By MARTIN THORNTON. S.P.C.K. 17s. 6d.

THOSE who read Mr Thornton's previous book on Pastoral Theology will remember that he tells us that "the parish seen as organism, elaborated into what I propose to describe as the Remnant Concept, arranges its three strata as concentric circles in which power from the centre pervades the whole". The faithful Remnant (inner circle) lives under rule—the Holy Eucharist on Sundays and Red Letter Days, the Daily Office, and private prayer which is to contain meditation, self-examination, confession, and recollection. It is from their regular work and worship that they are able to attract and inspire members of the congregation who have not yet attained their own committed state, and it is from their regular work and worship alone that they can have influence on the outside world (third circle).

All this is still at the centre in this collection of essays on Pastoral Reconstruction. The writer still has a sharp sword for anything that seems to blur this master concept, or hinders its application to the work of the parish. Organizations and the busy-ness of the clergy are firmly rejected; organizations use up valuable time which should be given to prayer, and the busy-ness of the clergy establishes a similar alibi. Their task is not to visit at large or to preach to big congregations, but rather by counsel and encouragement to lead people on towards affective prayer. There should be an aura of leisure round the clergy, and they should be found feeding pigs, digging ditches, and chopping wood.

Mr Thornton has already given us a book on Margery Kempe, and it is most refreshing to find an English priest directing us to a typically English devoutness like that of Margery Kempe or Mother Julian; but it is not true (at least nowadays) that the Ignatian method is "the one most frequently offered to the glorious 'simplicity' of English souls", for since the days of "Christian Mysticism" a whole host of books on affective prayer have appeared, and three of the best present tracts on meditation give affective prayer full attention.

This right emphasis on meditation leads Mr Thornton to say that for the laity the Bible is for meditation rather than study,—and this is true, provided the Bible is seen as a whole—God revealing himself in history. This apparently Mr Thornton does not care for, and his idea of substituting snippets in place of chapters or parts of chapters at the Daily Office is not helpful. Are we then to say all the psalms? Evensong on the fifteenth of the month would take rather more than the desired figure of ten minutes.

Similarly on visitation and preaching, we get excellence mixed up with stuff of very different quality. No one proposes to reduce visitation (in our present state of clerical shortage) to the mockery of one visit in twenty-five years (p.89); it is enough to let the parish know that the clergy will go anywhere at any time, and that the principle is seen to

be carried out in practice. As to preaching, Mr Thornton seems to have no idea of it as a united activity in which priest and congregation worship Christ, and no idea that it is the Holy Spirit who uses a preacher's words to speak with special force to individuals. He tells us "one cannot corporately instruct the unique". He is quite right to show that preaching should be followed up by counselling, and one would have thought that that, rather than any complete or even partial remembrance of sermons, was what happened when preaching was devout and good, and people were moved by the spirit of God to seek the wisdom and help of the preacher.

Perhaps this book would come into its own and prove most useful if it were read by groups of priests and lay-folk, well experienced in the various forms of parish work.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

RURAL ORGANIZATION

THE SOUTH ORMSBY EXPERIMENT. By A. C. SMITH. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

OUR countryside population is decreasing, and often there are neither the people nor the finance to preserve a parish as such. The South Ormsby experiment shows us twelve rural parishes brought into a group under one vicar with two curates and a woman worker. Each parish retains its parochial council and churchwardens, and the author of this book was vicar of all of them until his appointment as Archdeacon of Lincoln in 1960. He was connected with the scheme from its beginning in 1949.

The author, who intermingles his narrative with some very useful considerations, thinks it is in the village that a parish should have its biggest opportunities. He points out that there the parson (the squire having departed) is much more than ever the leader of the community. Mr Smith is confident that, provided the clergy will stay long enough, their work will be richly rewarded. He wisely suggests that an introduction to rural work would enable the newly ordained to consolidate the devotional training received at their theological college in a quieter atmosphere than is prevalent in many busy town parishes. After a few years, if he felt impelled to do so, he could go to one of such parishes armed with a strong inner life. Then at the end of his ministry the countryside would welcome back one familiar with it, and with ample time (freed from many duties) to pray and to help others to pray.

Mr Smith himself was not a countryman, and we can see that it enabled him to approach the local problems without any inherited prejudice. He is entirely right to emphasize the need for learning patience and "to cultivate in quietness the things of God", for without these qualities the personal ministry laid upon the clergy would be impossible, and the resistance to be faced and overcome unbearable.

It is to be hoped that this little book will be widely read, and that the author (now that he has told his story) may find time to develop further many of his important considerations, and to give us the benefit of them in another book.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

CHURCH AND PARISH

WHAT'S WHAT. A Complete Guide to the Church of England. By F. B. CHANCELLOR. Mowbrays. 7s. 6d.

THE PARISH SEEKS THE WAY. By MICHAEL HOCKING. Mowbrays. 10s. 6d.

What's What is described as a complete guide to the Church of England; and in the preface the author says his object has been to assemble, in concise form and simple language, various facts concerning the Church of England. He is aiming at educating or re-educating the ignorant and the forgetful, and feels he will be satisfied if he stimulates interest. There is a thoughtful introduction—a general survey, which does not, however, err on the side of optimism, and gives no inkling of the outburst of new life in the Church, for instance in experiments in the parishes and in relation to industry. The body of the work covers a very wide area, and is well informed. Any further edition can catch up with events, such as those connected with the development of evening Communion. A better index would be helpful, and the bewildering variety of Chapter Six, entitled "Miscellaneous", might be marshalled in some obvious order, instead of Yew Trees overshadowing Hot Cross Buns, and the Mothers' Union being preceded by Crucifixes and followed by the Sign of the Cross. There is a short but useful bibliography.

It is clear from *The Parish Seeks the Way* and other books like it, that the difficulties facing many of our parish priests have not turned them to despair, but to a vigorous reassessment of their work, its meaning and methods. The writer of this book, since 1954 the vicar of a working-class parish, St Ambrose's, Bristol, is obviously a devoted and courageous man, and the liberalism (central churchmanship) which he thinks so vital in dealing with his people has nothing about it of haziness or *laissez faire*. The Parish (or Family) Communion is to be the centre of their work and worship: "It is", Mr Hocking says, "a converting agency", though he recognizes that with its installation at ten o'clock many people will miss the quiet of the eight o'clock celebration, fasting will not be a general rule, and Mattins will tend to fall into the background. The author fully realizes that the strong emphasis on "the family" carries with it "a danger of narrow exclusiveness", and he has many good things to say about this in Chapter Sixteen, which has a message for rural deans and laity as well as the parish clergy.

The author has no use for "the prophets of doom", and has every reason, in his own experience, for knowing that "the Church of England can speak to the working classes in a language they can understand". His hopefulness is infectious.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

CHRISTIAN REDEMPTION

VICTOR AND VICTIM. By J. S. WHALE. Cambridge University Press. 18s. 6d.

ON THE dust cover of this book several tributes to Dr Whale's earlier work *Christian Doctrine* are reprinted. Many a minister, heavily involved in parochial duties, was grateful for that book. It was as Miss Sayers wrote "real popular theology". And what was said of the author then can well be repeated now: "He somehow manages to give a clearly outlined summary of what is most essential to each doctrine, without creating the 'text-book' feeling in the mind of the reader." He is an eager student of history and illustrates his points constantly by felicitous references to poetry and general literature.

Dr Whale's main theme is the Christian Doctrine of Redemption and three chapters are devoted to a direct exposition of the great metaphors of victory, sacrifice, and judgement which Scripture uses of the Cross. But in the remainder of the book he considers redemption in a wider sense. He asks how redemption is related to man's conception of time, how a particular act of redemption can be of universal significance, how the redeeming act can affect society at large and be sacramentally made real to the individual in the here and now. Finally he asks how man can be redeemed from death and what is the meaning of the resurrection of the body.

There is no attempt to by-pass the difficulties which the world at large feels about the Christian claim and the argument is carried forward in a lucid and well-ordered fashion. Occasionally I have the feeling that the problems raised are those of an earlier generation and that others more pressing have taken their place to-day. But I am confident that those who have received help from the author's earlier books will find here the same combination of vivid writing and ample learning devoted to the elucidation of the mysteries of the faith and to the promotion not only of intellectual integrity but also of true Christian spirituality.

F. W. DILLISTONE

CHRISTIAN THINKER

THE THOUGHT OF REINHOLD NIEBUHR. By GORDON HARLAND. Oxford University Press. 42s.

BOOKS about books can make dull reading. But this is certainly not the case with Gordon Harland's interpretation of the writings of Reinhold

Niebuhr. Perhaps this is partly due to the fact that Niebuhr's own thought has always been so exciting and so capable of stirring enthusiasm in his students. Nothing seems to be outside the range of his theology. So he never becomes stale or dated, for his eager mind is always ready to relate itself to new movements amongst men and nations and to view the life of man afresh in the light of God.

In his writings there have, of course (as in the epistles of a still more famous Christian leader), been some things hard to be understood. Often this may have happened when his judgements or principles have been read in some isolated application. We need to see his total theological and ethical system first and then the way that particular political and social problem can receive illumination within it. This Dr Harland enables us to do. As one who owes an immense debt to Niebuhr I am bound to say that I have never before gained such a comprehensive and satisfying understanding of the range and relevance of his thought as this book provides.

Dr Harland is a Canadian who has taught Church History both in Canada and the U.S.A. Hardly anything that Niebuhr has ever written or has been written about him can have escaped his notice. A section entitled "The Structure of Niebuhr's Understanding" is finely worked out and the centrality of the Cross in this structure impressively shown. Part Two of the book considers Politics, War and Peace, Economics and Race in a most helpful way. The selections from Niebuhr's own writings are well chosen and as an interpretation of the work of one of the greatest Christian thinkers of our time the book deserves the highest praise.

F. W. Dillistone

BIBLE LANGUAGE

New Testament Greek. By D. F. Hudson. E.U.P. 7s. 6d.

For decades we have thankfully used and complained about Nunn's *Elements of New Testament Greek*. Now within two years we have Dr Jay's *Introductory Grammar* and latterly *New Testament Greek* by D. F. Hudson in the "Teach Yourself" books. Dr Jay's book is a model of comprehensiveness but for the absolute beginner starting on his own it is heavy and frightening, not to say expensive, although of course ordinands, by grace of S.P.C.K., can get it cheaply.

Mr Hudson's book is quite extraordinarily cheap and of course much briefer. He has had a great deal of experience in language teaching and his book certainly does not share in the dullness which he attributes to most other grammars. On the contrary it is interesting and often amusing. It encourages an early use of the New Testament but at the same time guards us against dangers of over-familiarity by drawing on other Greek authors in sentences and examples.

Mr Hudson claims that if a student works with this book about eight hours a week for roughly twenty-eight weeks he will have a working knowledge of New Testament Greek. This is very likely true though it is significant that his other suggestion is that if the reader gets really stuck he should call on his nearest minister or clergyman for help. I can see this causing great consternation in many a parsonage house; and indeed one of the best uses to which this book could be put is for some of us to use it for brushing up our Greek.

Unfortunately because of the brevity of the book I think the student *is* likely to get stuck from time to time. All the same the book is excellent and should be of great use to those who wish to make a start on the Greek of the New Testament, though experience teaches that most will be well advised first to work through *Teach Yourself English Grammar*.

JOHN TRILLO

CHRISTIAN PROPAGANDA

KEY NEXT DOOR. By LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD. Hodder and Stoughton. 15s.

GOD OUR CONTEMPORARY. By J. B. PHILLIPS. Hodder and Stoughton. 3s. 6d.

EVANGELISM FOR TOMORROW. By CHARLES B. TEMPLETON. James Clarke. 7s. 6d.

IN A modest preface Dr Weatherhead points out that this collection of sermons may not read as well as they sounded. Those who know the attractiveness of his personality and his speaking may perhaps agree with this—these *are* sermons, and not simply good bits of writing. They are sermons of one who knows the needs of people, for he is a good psychologist as well as an obviously devoted pastor. If they are occasionally rather lightweight, they are never less than interesting, and full of useful illustrations and quotations.

Canon Phillips has chosen a very apposite title for this valuable book of Christian apologetic. He himself has rendered great service to the Christian Church by his modern versions of the Scriptures; and here he appeals to believers and agnostics alike to see that the Bible is always relevant to our needs and troubles, because God is the great contemporary. Least satisfactory, perhaps, on the insoluble problems of suffering and evil, he is quite excellent in dealing with "the inadequacies of humanism" and "the limitations of science".

The third book is a first-class consideration of the nature of evangelism, and also of the misconceptions which have led evangelists astray. The writer has spent over twenty years in the study and practice of evangelism, and is able to speak with wide knowledge and a charitable frankness. It is refreshing indeed to find evangelism so linked

with sound pastoral psychology, and a right emphasis on the place for the intellect. The author points to the pulpit as "the heart of any strategy to win the world". "The preacher", he says, "who speaks to this generation need never fear that he has nothing relevant to say, and that there is no hunger to hear.".

While giving high place to lay people in visitation evangelism, the author emphasizes the absolute need of adequate preparation of the visitors, and adequate follow-up ("nurture", he calls it) of initial inquiries and decisions. This is an excellent book for clergy and laity alike, with a great clarity, and a real sense of urgency.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

TERTULLIAN'S "RESURRECTION"

TERTULLIAN'S TREATISE ON THE RESURRECTION. Edited by ERNEST EVANS. S.P.C.K. 50s.

DR EVANS has once again put us all in his debt by his edition of Tertullian's treatise *De Resurrectione Carnis*. The scale and scope of his work is similar to his editions of Tertullian *Against Praxeas* and *On the Incarnation*. It is certainly a remarkable achievement for a parish priest to have produced work of this quality over so long a period.

The introduction is adequate and contains a valuable account of earlier work on the subject by the Apologists and particularly St Irenaeus to whom Tertullian was much indebted. The text is based upon the recent edition of Dr Borleffs in the series *Corpus Christianorum* but Dr Evans has not hesitated to differ from him (usually on good grounds) on a number of occasions. The translation is accurate and reads smoothly.

Within its limits the commentary is a competent piece of work. Dr Evans is an accomplished Latinist who has devoted a lifetime to the study of his author. It is therefore not surprising to find him at his best on textual points and the vocabulary of Tertullian. The divergences from the biblical text of Tertullian's quotation from Scripture (whether textual or translation variants or possible lapses of memory) are carefully noted. On the other hand there are matters (chiefly with regard to background information) on which we should have liked to be more fully informed. The note on traducianism on page 300 is a case in point. The impression is sometimes given that the theological side of the commentary might have been strengthened with advantage and the place of Tertullian in the development of the doctrine more fully presented, but due account must be taken here alike of the nature of the doctrine itself and the state of the question at the time at which Tertullian was writing.

H. E. W. TURNER

JEW AND GREEK

HEBREW THOUGHT COMPARED WITH GREEK. By THORLIEF BOMAN. S.C.M. 21s.

THE author of this book, issued as a contribution to the "Library of History and Doctrine", is an eminent Norwegian scholar. Before it appeared in English it had already been published in three German and two Japanese editions, in itself an eloquent tribute to the interest of the subject with which it deals, and to the treatment which this subject has received in this Essay. An edition in English, the translation by a Professor in an American University, is therefore much to be welcomed. Attached to its Contents is a valuable list of books and pamphlets bearing on its subject.

That subject, as the title indicates, is "a comparison of the intellectual world of the Old Testament and the intellectual world of the Greek". And to illustrate the latter Plato is especially chosen. But why, over against the Old Testament, Plato rather than the New Testament, written as the latter was wholly in Greek and for Greek speaking readers? The reason is obvious. It is that the New Testament, written in Greek though it was, is far from being, as Plato eminently is, a representative deposit of Greek thinking. It was written, for the most part, by men of Hebrew stock who inevitably carried over into the language medium which they used modes of thought characteristic of the tradition which they had inherited, and in which their minds were steeped. On the other hand the New Testament is no mere reproduction in Greek of Hebrew ways of thinking. Greek thought appears in it too. Rather does it represent a synthesis of the two widely differing modes of thought in which each is carried to its highest level, and contributes to the total picture.

It is in the terms "dynamic" and "static" that the writer expresses what, to him, is the primary difference, and contrast, between Hebrew and Greek ways of thinking, although for static he prefers the term "harmonic" or "resting". "Rest, harmony, composure, and self-control, this is the Greek way; movement, life, deep emotion, and power, this is the Hebrew way" (p. 205). Put in personal terms, it is the difference between a Socrates standing stock still, wrapt in contemplation, and the Jewish worshipper swaying rhythmically to and fro as he listens, and responds, to the prophetic words of Scripture. Put in terms of the faculty employed by Greek and Hebrew respectively, it is the difference between "logical thinking", cold, hard, objective on the one hand, and "psychological understanding", with its strong emotional undercurrent, as well as its intellectual element, on the other. And as the supreme "reality" apprehended along these differing lines, it is the difference between a conception of God as "an active personality who, through appropriate acts, is leading the world, and especially mankind, to a goal" (the Hebrew way), and as "a reasonable being who is disclosing himself to man through the world as a system of symbols" (the Greek way).

Indeed, if the object of the mental quest in each case is looked for, the difference and contrast could hardly be better expressed than in the words of St Paul, "the Jews ask for signs, and Greeks seek after wisdom" (1 Cor. 1. 22), "signs" on the one hand as instances of divine intervention on the plane of history in which Jahveh, the God of action, uses the visible order as the instrument of his purpose, and "wisdom" on the other, exemplified in a Plato, as insight into the eternal realities which underlie the passing earthly scene. Nor, it may be added, are these differing quests contradictory or irreconcilable. Certainly for St Paul they each attain their goal in "Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God" (ibid., v. 24), Christ the final instrument of Jahveh's redemptive purpose, but Christ also the focal point of revelation, at which the mystery at the heart of things is unveiled.

But it is, perhaps, in the implication of the term Dabhar on the one hand, and Logos on the other, that a comparison between the Hebrew and Greek ways of thinking can best be made. Both terms are normally translated "word". Yet their meanings widely diverge. In neither case is the "word" merely the spoken utterance. Dabhar is a "power-laden" term, charged with divine, active, creative efficacy, as in e.g. Is. LV 10. Logos, on the other hand, is "the meaning, the ordered and reasonable content" (p. 67). And between them "these two words teach us what the two people considered primary and essential in mental life; on the one hand the dynamic, masterful, energetic—on the other hand the ordered, moderate, thought out, calculated, meaningful, rational" (p. 68).

There is, indeed, a superficial resemblance between the Dabhar of Jahveh in the Old Testament, with its implications of power in action, and the divine word in the cults of the ancient East. In both the word is "a mighty dynamic force". There, however, the resemblance ends. In Babylonia and Assyria, as in Egypt, the word is a personified force of Nature, irrational, non-moral and destructive. On the other hand the Dabhar of Jahveh is always "the function of a conscious and moral personality" (p. 60). Thus, for all their formal similarity, the two conceptions of his word are poles asunder. Indeed, in its implication of a rational purposeful order the Dabhar of the Old Testament is far nearer to the Logos of Greek thought than to his impersonal force of destruction in which the divine word is represented as being in the great hymn to Ellil.

Here again it is in the New Testament that the two terms, Dabhar and Logos, with their widely differing histories and implications, find their reconciliation. The question so long in dispute as to whether behind the "Word" of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel is the Dabhar of the Hebrew scriptures or the Logos of Greek philosophy need not be asked, at least if an answer is looked for in terms of one to the exclusion of the other. For here the two ways of thinking, Hebrew and Greek, which underlie the two terms, converge. Here the quests of both Jew and Greek reach their goal. For St John, as for St Paul,

Christ, the Word made Flesh, is both the "power of God" and the "wisdom of God", the instrument of both divine creative and redemptive energy and of divine self-disclosure, the final vehicle of both "grace and truth"; and "when the Fourth Evangelist pronounces the word logos at the beginning of his Gospel, the many profound meanings of Dabhar, as well as of Logos, harmonise into a mysterious and beautiful unity for him as well as for his Greek speaking readers" (p. 69).

It is not without interest to add that in a chapter bearing the title "Symbolism and Instrumentalism" Dr Boman refers with much appreciation to the work of Canon Quick in connection with the subject of this book, as illustrated especially by a course of lectures published some thirty years ago under the title *The Gospel of Divine Action*. In these lectures Canon Quick found in the words "signs and instruments" the distinction between Hellene and Hebrew in the interpretation, characteristicic of each, of the world around them. Substitute the word "symbol", for signs, and you have also Dr Boman's thesis. He would agree with Canon Quick that "the distinction between instrumentalism and symbolism in connexion with theology corresponds roughly with the distinction between the Israelite manner of thinking in the Old Testament and the Greek manner of thinking in Platonism" (p. 187).

But Canon Quick goes further, and finds in these terms the distinction between St Paul and St John, in what for each is primary in the revelation of God in Christ. St Paul, with his strong Hebraic background, "thinks of God's love primarily in historical terms as grace". St John, no Hellenist but in sympathy with Hellenic ideals, "thinks of God's love, primarily as the eternal truth" (Quick, op. cit., p. 81). Yet with all their difference of emphasis, they are at one in the things of the spirit, and point the way to the synthesis which is called for between the Hebraic approach, on the one hand, and the Greek on the other to the ultimate mystery.

There are other points of comparison between the two ways of thinking, Hebrew and Greek, to which the author of this book calls attention, and which he illustrates with the scholarly erudition characteristic of his work throughout. But to these there is no space to allude. Enough has been said to indicate the value and importance of this book, its importance not least in the light which it throws on the two strands of thought which underlie the language of the New Testament, reconciled and consummated in him, in whom "there can be neither Jew nor Greek" (Gal. 3. 28).

P. A. Micklem

FAITH AND SCIENCE

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND GREEK PHILOSOPHY. By A. H. ARMSTRONG and R. A. MARKUS. Darton, Longman and Todd. 15s.

THE Professor of Greek and a Lecturer in Mediaeval History at Liverpool have combined to produce this very good book. They have each written five chapters, and they have shared out their topics in such a way that Professor Armstrong mainly treats of metaphysics and Mr Markus of ethics, but the division is by no means strict; Mr Markus for example has dealt with the nature of Time far more intelligibly than is usual. His contribution is twice as long as the Professor's, and without at all wishing it was shorter, I wish very much that the Professor's was longer. They both write lucidly and to the point, and they do not take much for granted, but it is just a question whether a person with no knowledge of Greek philosophy would find the book easy reading; the authors have done their best for him, but better still for those who have some smattering (or do I mean tincture?) of Greek, and good Grecians will find new things here too. Professor Armstrong has some timely remarks on the Christian attitude to science: he ascribes to the influence of Plotinus "in the long run the very satisfactory result that a Catholic Christian philosopher or theologian can accept any scientific theory that the evidence seems to require (provided that it is a genuine theory of nature science and not a piece of disguised philosophizing) without its affecting his philosophy or theology in any important way" (pp. 40, 41). "The way of thinking presented by St Leo surely implies that the study and exploitation of the material universe by the methods of natural science should never be of great importance or interest to the Christian community or to most individual Christians. Natural science is good and legitimate, because the material creation is good, and it may provide the devout scientist with motives for praising God in his works; but it is not on the normal direct route to God" (p.41). "The Catholic apologist seems to be justified in pointing out the technical advances and the contributions of scientific theory which were made (generally rather casually and incidentally) in mediaeval Christendom, and in asserting that in principle the Church gives all legitimate freedom to the scientist. But the anti-Christian scientific humanist also seems to be right in seeing Christian, and in particular Catholic, religion as an obstacle to large-scale rapid scientific progress, unhampered by any serious extra-scientific concerns and inhibitions, which, it appears likely, is only possible in a society where traditional Christianity (or any other of the great religions) has very little real influence" (p. 42).

The Professor admits that a very different view of the proper relationship of science and religion may be taken.

The book appears with a *Nihil Obstat* and an *Imprimatur*, but there is nothing of Christian doctrine nor any use of the word Catholic in the book which would not be quite acceptable to a sound Anglican. I

will not say that the book is "a must", but it surely is "a not to be missed", which after all is very nearly the same thing.

ADAM FOX

SCOTTISH WORTHIES

FATHERS OF THE KIRK. Edited by R. SELBY WRIGHT. Oxford University Press. 21s.

THIS book, as its title suggests, is an offering of filial piety, inspired by the fourth centenary of the Reformation in Scotland. Fifteen sixty is commonly and rightly regarded as the crucial year in that process, though it needs to be remembered that one hundred and thirty years of struggle intervened before the final victory of Presbyterianism in 1690. The book before us throws much valuable light on the whole of that period, and on the later history of the Church of Scotland up to the time which is still in living memory. It consists of twenty-three biographical sketches, all worth attention and some of absorbing interest. The well-known Editor, who contributes a useful Foreword, has been broad-minded enough to include two bishops in his list of worthies, and two Anglicans among his contributors. The list itself extends from John Knox (d. 1572) to James Cooper (d. 1922). All these, except the two latest—James Denney and James Cooper—and Thomas Guthrie (1803-73) find a place in Professor Burleigh's masterly work, *A Church History of Scotland.*

It is impossible here to give an account of all these short biographies; and to many of them different readers will have different reactions. It is certainly a representative selection; indeed the book might almost borrow a sub-title from the late Dr Prestige's Bampton Lectures, *Fathers and Heretics*: for Edward Irving, McLeod Campbell, and Robertson Smith were condemned and suspended for unorthodox teaching by the ecclesiastical authorities of their time. Ebenezer Erskine, the Seceder (1680-1754), had been given the same treatment at an earlier date, though not charged with any formal heresy. And Thomas Chalmers, who led the Disruption of 1843, was plainly a schismatic from the point of view of the Established Church.

There is something rather formidable in many of these eminent "Fathers of the Kirk"; but one would have been continuously happy, it seems, in the company of several of them: McLeod Campbell, Thomas Guthrie, John Cairns, John Caird, to name only a few; and above all, perhaps, Archbishop Leighton, who is still a living inspiration in Scotland to Episcopalians and Presbyterians alike.

✠ ERIC GRAHAM